MIDDLE HIGH AND NEW HIGH GERMAN

HUGO STEGER

0. INTRODUCTION

The task of reporting on 'Current Trends' must, because of the variety of approaches and the mass of literature for Middle High German and New High German, be taken very literally. Thus, we can deal only with the basic directions, with regard to matter and methodology, in which linguistics is moving, and only very rarely can we discuss specific problems.

The concept of linguistics is very broad for Middle High German; that is, the history of language is given a great deal of consideration. For New High German the range is rather more restricted to grammatical problems.

In each of the individual sections, Middle High German is discussed and Early New High German and New High German are included, so that any overlapping towards the one side or the other is balanced out.

Sections 1 and 2 are each divided into (1) Grammar and lexicology; (2) Language history; and (3) Further linguistic problems.

Although, given the nature of the task, only selected literature can be brought to bear, I do use a relatively large number of quotes.

Post-World War II efforts in the researching of the Middle High German and New High German linguistic systems are characterized by four methodological principles:

1. The form of research which is defined by historical, geographical, and comparative philological methods, and which is rooted in the early nineteenth century, is still productive. The Romantics, with Jakob Grimm in the forefront, had fixed its direction. Through the Neo-Grammarians and the development of dialect geography, historical linguistics had, by the end of the nineteenth century, taken on new emphases which, with methodological refinements, are still influential today.

2. A specifically German form of structuralism, dating from the 1920s and early 1930s, is being pursued and is producing, in addition to a number of individual studies, drafts and plans for a new German grammar. From the very beginning, this branch of research has turned its attention to the problems of a structural semantics, and is to be understood as a content-based theory of grammar (*inhaltsbezogene Grammatik*). This branch of linguistics has as its precedent the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt, and, accordingly, refers back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth

centuries in a manner different from that of the branch mentioned under 1).

3. At last, after long hesitation, the taxonomic structural methods of the Prague phonologists, of the Bloomfield school, and of the Copenhagen circle around L. Hjelmslev are gradually finding acceptance; however, research abroad is still in advance of the German.

4. In contrast, the new descriptive models of grammar of Chomsky and Tesnière, which appeared at the close of the 1950s, are being accepted relatively quickly in Germany, and are being applied to New High German. Since the early 1960s, German research has been taking an active part in the controversy over the further development of these most advanced descriptive models. Concerning the implications, above all of semantic problems, there is at present (1969) for some basic questions an intimate connection with the German branch of structuralism mentioned under 2) above — in an explicit manner, however, and with an entirely different view of the problems of universals.

1. MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN AND EARLY NEW HIGH GERMAN

1.0 *Introduction*

Methodologically, research in the Middle High German language period has continued chiefly along the paths prescribed by the philologists of the twenties and thirties. In the area of etymology, the methodological influence of the word-field theory as it originated in the thirties should be noted. In the area of phonology and morphology the influence of taxonomic structuralism has haltingly made itself apparent, and has even been extended to the point of urging a revision of Middle High German grammars and textbooks. The problems of the most modern structuralism have not yet been applied to Middle High German.

The chief concentration of scholarly effort is in language history. Work has been done in almost all areas of linguistics; nevertheless, etymology, the theme 'language and history', and the language of documents form the focal point in the literature. Most recently, research particularly in prose and in Early New High German has received attention.

For the scholarship of the twenties and thirties cf. (still) Michels 1924; Arntz 1934; Maurer 1934; Stroh 1934.

1.1 *Grammar and Lexicology*

1.1.0 *Handbooks of German Grammar*

With the methods of, primarily, the Neo-Grammarians, a good survey of the graphemic and morphological problems and also, in part, of the syntax of the Middle

High German literary language was achieved during the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth. This was included in the various older grammars. The more recent individual studies have been and continue to be incorporated into revised descriptions of Middle High German, but in general the framework remains unchanged.

The grammars which had their origins in the Neo-Grammarian era were usually more strictly immersed in the stream of historical linguistics; the synchronic principle was diffused, and the *Sprachgeographie* (approximately, the regional distribution of dialects) developed in the twenties achieved more recognition (Paul and Schmitt 1950; Helm-Ebbinghaus 1961; Paul and Mitzka 1966; Weinhold, Ehrismann, and Moser 1968; Paul, Moser, and Schröbler 1969).

Detailed introductions usually go beyond the duties of a grammar in the narrower sense in that they treat (often with maps) problems of social and regional stratification and classification and the position of the courtly poetic language of the Middle Ages.

As regards the text itself, there follows a section on pronunciation, and a section on phonology and accidence, which is organized according to the parts of speech. Paul and Mitzka's syntax (1966) is still based on Behaghel's theory of syntax from the thirties, which has not been further adapted. Schröbler's chapters on syntax are based on a sound collection of material and the use of the traditional understanding of syntax as an expanded morphology. After the war, new treatments of Middle High German grammar appeared (Eis 1958; Mettke 1964; de Boor and Wisniewski 1967). Influenced by academic instruction, they likewise emphasize the historical principle, and are often limited to phonology and morphology.

The introductions to Middle High German by Zupitza (revised by Fritz Tschirch) (1960) and by Saran (revised by B. Nagel) (1964) have been brought up to the more recent level of research within the sphere of the pre-structural, historical grammar, but maintain the older framework.

E. Oksaar (1965) has published a new volume as an introduction to Middle High German (including its literature) with abundant sociolinguistic and structural information which aims for a balance between synchronic and diachronic linguistics. Asher's *A short descriptive grammar of Middle High German* (1967) seems particularly successful as an introduction without historical grammar.

Only sections 1 and 3 of the first volume of V. Moser's Early New High German grammar (1929–51) were completed, providing only partial treatment of the phonology. There exists a small introduction to Early New High German by Brooke (1955).

1.1.1 *Phonology*

If one surveys the newer literature, which works with traditional methods, then it becomes clear that refinements with more material have been undertaken on relatively few focal points; likewise that all earlier assumptions have been attested by more abundant material. This is more or less valid for the treatment of the 'New High German' diphthongs (of the Old High German/Middle High German high long

vowels) in the studies by Lindgren (1961) and Wiesinger (1962), who, however, does draw in phonological considerations as well. The same can be said for Lindgren's work on apocope (1953) and on the disappearance of the preterit in Upper German (1957); cf. also Dal (1960).

Still a basic problem is the description of the appearance of new graphemes in the written records of the high and late Middle Ages and in relation to the distributional relationships which come to light (e.g. the progress of Hiatus-Diphthongization), the question of the extent of their distribution and the inhibiting factors (in the apocope-group, for example, incipient syncretism: *Tag* : *Tage*). But the connections between the grapheme-system and the phoneme-system remain, in general, limited by the diversity and the widely-scattered nature of the material; the functioning of the entire phonemic system, the relationship of individual spellings, of the specific monument to the 'norm' of a unified Middle High German literary dialect, whether or not it be regionally subdivided, still receive too little attention. Even when one takes into consideration that we can expect only partial insights here, the 'atomistic' method employed more than necessarily obscures the insecure position of our view and the unsatisfactory state of the description of the grammatical system of Middle High German. All too often we fail to advance from the history of writing to the development of language systems.

Yet, the answer to the question concerning the significance of historical observations depends upon the clarification of the relationship between grapheme-system and phoneme-system. Lüdtke (1968) recently indicated an approach which takes the appearance of diphthong-spellings in the Latin documents of a border region as the starting-point for the thought that the changing of a written norm (as in the case of the diphthongs) is bound to the composition of another, neighboring, written norm, and can scarcely testify as to the time of a beginning of phonetic change.

Since the thirties, taxonomic structuralism has also gradually begun to have an effect on the historical stages of the German language; the Prague school and the Bloomfield school were a part of this. 'Phonological' ('graphematic') observations are here overwhelmingly in the foreground.

After the Second World War this work is augmented somewhat, especially abroad. But at the same time, the contribution of Pfalz (1954), who is concerned with the phonetics of Middle High German, recalls the thirties in every respect.

The phonological consideration of *Umlaut* forms a crux at present (Twadell 1938; Penzl 1949; Kratz 1960; Sonderegger 1959). In this view, primary and secondary *Umlaut* are seen as the splitting off of phonemes from original allophones through the disappearance of Middle High German final syllables; the chronological problems are still a difficulty, however. In part, *Umlaut* has been placed in the context of common Germanic, for example by Antonsen (1961, 1964); but phonetic problems of splitting have been drawn in as well, for example by Fourquet (1952), who does not convince me here.

Attempts to work with the normalized grapheme-system of Middle High German

and to place it in relation to the phonemic system of living dialects have been undertaken by Moulton (1965), Philipp (1965), and Steger (1968).

There are also, however, more comprehensive attempts to describe the medieval phonological system, for example by Bonnin (1960) and Moulton (1961–62), who treats Middle High German in the framework of his history of the German vocalic system on a taxonomic basis.

These earlier attempts have the disadvantage of still being oriented to normalized Middle High German. Now, it cannot readily be refuted that this normalized Middle High German grapheme-system does rather well reflect the phonemic relationships within a literary language which excludes regionalisms. But a methodically stricter proof of this has not been offered, and therefore it remains to be seen to what extent a more precise insight into the phonemic relationships of the Middle High German literary language can successfully be gained through the graphemic analysis of manuscripts. With the presently wavering notions about grammar, it remains an open question to what extent a satisfactory phonology of the Middle High German notational scheme can be achieved without taking the morphemic relationships into account. Even after the attempts to place phonology into the framework of a transformational generative grammar, as Chomsky, Halle, Bierwisch, and others have proposed, studying the basic notational scheme of a language or dialect in isolation still seems to me to be worthwhile. Probably one must also take into consideration whether or not the difficulties and sources of error which result from the lack of competence in dead languages and dialects can be effectively minimized by isolating the phonological system. Cf. also Fourquet (1967); *Phonologie der Gegenwart* (1967).

Important contributions to these last-posed questions are the studies by Besch (1961) and Fleischer (1965a and b), who first of all investigated the relationship of the phoneme and the grapheme in the language of documents of the late Middle Ages and in the development of the New High German literary language. Fleischer then published more comprehensive structural studies on the history of New High German (1966), which are based on Early New High German and which aspire to a significant synthesis of diachronic and synchronic linguistics.

M. Philipp (1968) approaches the particular problems of the late medieval grapheme-/phoneme-system of one author with an exact method and with considerable success. A more precise investigation of the Middle High German phonemic system can be significantly advanced by progressing in the manner here employed in such an exemplary way.

1.1.2 *Morphology and Syntax*

The pursuit of problems of morphology and syntax in Middle High German and Early New High German has likewise proceeded according to the historical-philological method to some extent. Structural methods have contributed less.

Ahlsson (1965) clarifies problems of noun inflections in the Thuringian written dialects of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Fischer (1955) views the morpho-

logical situation of the adjective in Middle High German lyric poetry, and Sparmann (1961) describes, in a thorough paper, the pronouns in the language of Middle High German documents.

Saltveit works in the area of verbs in several studies (1956–57, 1960, 1962, 1968), in particular with the future tense. Marache (1960) illustrates the grammatical functions of the verbal *ge-* prefix, and Körner, in a Vienna dissertation (1964), is concerned with the position of the finite verb in Gottfried von Strassburg's declarative sentences.

On the topic of conjunctions and prepositions, Schröbler deals with the comparative and relative *und* (1966). Schildt (1965) treats the locative prepositions, Dresel (1966) the temporal prepositions in early East Middle High German of the twelfth to the fourteenth century. Krömer (1959–64) deals extensively with the prepositions in the High German Genesis and in the Exodus.

Adelberg (1960) has treated, from a historical point of view, the sentences of the type *Ih bin ez Joseph* in Middle High German, and some Russian studies have turned their attention to problems of sentence structure and of *einfache Negation* ('simple negation'), for example Korakova (1961) and Bulach (1960).

In morphology, Werner (1965) and Stopp and Moser (1967) have provided taxonomic studies on both the verbal and nominal inflection systems.

On the topic of word-formation, only D. Hofmann's study of the *k*-diminutives in North Frisian and other related languages (1962) shows a rather positive beginning for the systematic consideration of morphological systems. For the development of Upper German he designates slowly unfolding neutral unified systems on the basis of neutral suffixes for the base words of all three genders. M. Schröder (1962:151) has treated the Early Middle High German *-lich* formations from a historical point of view; Tschentscher (1962:1, 39, 67) has worked on the history of the formative *-tum*.

1.1.3 *Etymology*

In addition to a rather large number of studies on syntax and etymology, which can be better discussed in connection with the treatment of the development of language history, the discussion of and research in Middle High German semantics play a considerable part.

This discussion includes in part the specifically German form of structuralism which appeared in the 1920s and which is represented primarily by the names Weisgerber, Trier, and Porzig, among others.

On the one hand, after the Second World War, the followers of the originally presented fundamentals of the structure of the word-field two concise critical surveys may suffice: Seiffert 1968; Hoberg 1970 extend their conclusions, confront them with new material, and modify them. This is more or less the case for Peters' studies on word-fields and word-content (*Wortinhalte*) (1955), which also bears on New High German vocabulary. H. Schwarz' "Leitmerkmale sprachlicher Felder" (1959) and Weisgerber's *Die vier Stufen in der Erforschung der Sprachen* (1963), as well as Trier's speech at the presentation of the Duden-prize (1968) and Gipper's studies on *Stuhl*

(1959a) and *Sessel* (1959b), belong here too. All trends in research are summarized in Gipper (1963) and Gipper and Schwarz (1962). L. Schmidt (1968–69) offers a good survey.

On the other hand, the critics have been making themselves heard: as early as 1944, Dornseiff published his study "List und Kunst". He returns to this theme in *Sprache und Sprechender* (1964). Betz turns decidedly against word-field theory in: "Zur Überprüfung des Feldbegriffes" (1953). Maier's study on "Die Feldlehre und ihr Gegensatz zu den tatsächlichen Sprachgegebenheiten untersucht an Wörtern des Freudebereichs in Gottfrieds 'Tristan', Hartmanns 'Armen Heinrich' und 'Iwein' und im 'Nibelungenlied'" (1955) should also be included here. See the summary by Bahner (1962) for a complete picture of this critical position.

Particularly in the light of the most modern efforts toward structural semantics, the methodological weaknesses of the word-field theory of early German structuralism are brought to the surface. Its lack of explicitness, its partial obscuring of the relationships between symbol, meaning, sphere of meaning, and that which is symbolized, the fact that its abstraction in operating with total word-nuclei in isolation is too limited to serve as a model, the extremely intuitive associations of word-meaning and word-intent, and the lack of a reference to syntax, which Porzig early sought to overcome — all this becomes especially clear. In the application of this method to historical material, the lack of linguistic competence is an additional, very significant disadvantage. Indeed, the position of semantics in grammar is only now beginning to be clear.

Nevertheless, the fundamental idea of the taxonomists, namely of observing the oppositional relationships in simultaneously functioning vocabulary, produced results for Middle High German in all cases where a contextual analysis in the micro- and macrosphere was carried out with greatest care, and these results must not be underestimated.

Some of the studies on medieval word-history (to be mentioned in section 1.2.3) have also been influenced by the word-field theory.

In 1966 Rosengren undertook an attempt to develop a quantitative semantic distributional analysis of Middle High German adjectives. His approach is methodologically interesting but open to criticism in the theoretical fundamentals of the semantic theory and statistics.

1.1.4 *Lexicology*

Lexicology of Middle High German has nothing very successful to exhibit, even after the war. The project of a new Middle High German dictionary, which was for a long time directed by U. Pretzel, has still not made any progress. Except for a supplement to Lexer's *Taschenwörterbuch* (since the 29th edition, 1959), there is nothing available after decades of work. Cf. however Vogt (1961).

Wiessner (1954) offers a good specialized glossary to Neidhart; Dalby (1965) offers a very useful 'Lexicon' of hunting terms in the Middle Ages.

Especially useful are the word-indexes for Middle High German literary monuments

produced in the United States (Heffner and Petersen 1942; Heffner and Lehmann 1950; Valk 1958; Heffner 1961; Scholler 1965). They are based on normalized texts, are produced by computer, and have some disadvantages corresponding to the then imperfect state of the programming for linguistic purposes. The primary disadvantage was that the homographs could not be separated, so that we are left with alphabetical wordlists pure and simple, without any grouping of the forms in relation to a base form. A newer generation of indexes, all of which offer contexts but still have many weaknesses which nowadays could be eliminated, was initiated by Wisbey. A first result, the complete verse concordance to the Vienna Genesis, is provisionally complete, together with a retroactive dictionary (Wisbey 1967; for the entire project cf. Wisbey 1964).

The lexicography of Early New High German is still very much in its infancy. A few partial studies in this area have been done, for example Mollay (1967–68). In other respects we must still rely on Götze's *Glossar* (1956).

1.2 *Language History*

In general, the focal point of language research, especially in Middle High German, is and remains language history, and usually includes several stages of the German language. This is also clearly true of the presentation of Middle High German in the summarizing studies of German and Germanic philology: Stroh (1952), E. Schwarz (1951), Stammler (1957).

1.2.0 *General and Introductory Works*

General studies on the history of the German language, which are for the most part revised editions of older works and do not always accurately reflect the state of present-day research, are by Bach (1965); Sperber and von Polenz (1966) (especially up-to-date but very short); Moser (1957, 1968); Eggers (1965); Tschirch (2 vols., 1966–68). Cf. also Jungandreas (1947); Rooth (1962); W. Schmidt (1959); Filičeva (1959); Guchman (1955–59, 1964).

Given the diversity of the factors acting together in the development of a language and its subdivisions, and the difficulty in separating them to a sufficiently precise extent for the purposes of scientific presentation, it is not astonishing that even the more extensive presentations of language history frequently describe only observations. They fail to arrive at an explanation because the surveyable horizon is not sufficient and because we are still far from an adequate sociolinguistic method or even a sociolinguistic theory of the Middle Ages into which the observed facts can be incorporated. A second possibility is a more essayistic mode of presentation. It too has been used with success, since it can, under some circumstances, better sum up several simultaneous trends than can the mere presentation of data.

On the one hand, research in Middle High German has been oriented toward the

changes which become graphemically apparent during the transition from Old High German to Middle High German and during the course of Middle High German, and also to innovations in word-formation and syntax. However, it has likewise concentrated on the internal linguistic changes brought about by changes in the social and intellectual structure, such as the modification, reformation, and borrowing of vocabulary items and the changing usages in the application of syntactic rules (stylistics). Still, most of the structural grammatical changes, which were, to a great extent, triggered by phonological processes and only later stabilized through analogy, and other similar processes, have not yet been thought through in terms of their consequences for the entire grammatical system. Furthermore, they are not always sufficiently clearly separated from the innovations brought about by social and intellectual changes as to the actual historical acts of speech. Here it must be remembered that a total separation of the two areas is impossible or at best very difficult to achieve, but it must also be emphasized that it is, after all, a question of two quite different kinds of linguistic 'history', the mutual relationships of which must be more closely investigated. Furthermore, it is not at all easy to bring the appearance of new forms in literary tradition and their actual origin into a chronological order, since the reasons why innovations in the syntactic, morphological, and phonological systems become graphemically apparent will be of a quite different sort from those for the appearance of vocabulary and styles in the literary language.

1.2.1 *Phonology and Morphology*

For individual historical studies in the area of phonology and morphology cf. under 1.1.1. Observations and insights with regard to the changes in Middle High German resources for word-formation and in sentence structure have been made in part by independent research: Oehmann (1953); Seppänen and Valtasaari (1953); Kurth (1953); Rosenquist (1954); Erben (1950); Tamsen (1963).

1.2.3 *Word-History*

In the area of word-history, Maurer and Stroh's work (1959) is available, partially revised and with a number of supplementary chapters (for the parts which could not be changed). This work reflects in its methods even more strongly the position of research in the 1940s. In 1967 E. Schwarz published a new edition of his *Wortgeschichte*, which serves as an excellent introduction. Schwarz understands etymology primarily as a mirror of cultural history. For the first time, the consequences of dialect geography for word-history are summarized.

The period since the end of the Second World War has produced a large number of independent studies on the meaning and history of words, fields, and concepts in Middle High German, which in part employ the traditional historical-philological method and are in part under the influence of the word-field theory. Among other things were published studies on 'rein und unrein' (Kramer 1950); 'innerlich' (Bruckner 1955); *gelücke, heil, sælde* (Salzer 1953, Sanders 1965); *riuwe* in Hartmann and

Wolfram (W. Schröder 1959b); *Freiheit* and *Frieden* (Mezger 1956); the vine-culture terminology (Alanne 1950, 1963); *List* (Hermans 1953); *wirde-wirdekeit* (Schnoor 1962); *êre* (Riechert 1952, Maurer 1963b); the terminology and the key-words of courtly poetry (Schauber 1945, Moret 1949, Maurer 1950, Giese 1951, Hg. Kuhn 1951, Karl 1952, Kolb 1952, Weber 1953, Taugel 1955, Furstner 1956, Götz 1957, Schweikle 1963, Bachofer 1963, Wierciensky 1964, Seppänen 1967); *Gnade* and *Huld* at the time of Salier and Staufer (Leuthold 1953); *Leid* (Maurer 1964b, Allweyer 1951, Schmidt 1952, Pleuser 1967); *zwîvel* (Düring 1944, W.J. Schröder 1947, Hempel 1951); *sünde* (Frank 1949); *sêle, lîp, herze* (Fickel 1948); metaphors for the heart and the virtues (Meyer 1946, Heimplätzer 1953, Sayce 1959, Spiewok 1963, Maurer 1963a and b, Speckenbach 1965, Jauch 1951); *adel* and *edel* (Zutt 1956, Maurer 1968); *gote, got* (M.-L. Dittrich 1960) and a number of other lexical, semantic, and etymological problems of the high and late Middle Ages: Heberling 1947; Fränzel 1947; Hollands 1948; Hahn 1949; Maurer 1963a; Riemen 1955; Gruenter 1955, 1957, 1961, 1962; Tubach 1959; Dalby 1961; Kemper 1962; Fechter 1963.

Particularly important here has been the renewed interest in the concept of the *ritter*, which supplants a series of older opinions of Germanists (Bumke 1964).

Kranzmayer (1960) and Steger (for the first half of the fourteenth century) (1962b) have written on regional vocabulary and on its consequences for word-geography.

1.2.4 *Research on Prose*

On the whole, research on the prose of the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries had had only a faltering beginning; therefore it was first of all necessary to prepare the material and to make it available. This is the situation for religious prose, where, except in some areas of mysticism, very little has been done. The same is true for the broad area of secular, technical prose (*Fachprosa*) which gradually develops during this period. In both areas the uncovering and preparing of material has progressed; cf. Eis 1966, 1961; Keil 1968; Steer 1966; Ruh 1955, 1956.

Even today, however, linguistic treatment of this area, except for the language of Meister Eckhard, has not progressed particularly far. In work on the Mystics, problems of vocabulary and terminology have always played the largest part, but questions of word-formation have usually been treated as a part of this: Allweyer 1951, Pleuser 1967. Syntax and problems of style have recently received a greater share of attention: Stötzel 1966, Leier 1965. Kämpf (1966) has studied the language of the 'Unterweisung zur Vollkommenheit' from a historical point of view.

1.2.5 *Language and History*

A fruitful subdivision of scholarly work in German language history in the last few decades can be summed up by the phrase 'language and history'. It was stimulated by studies from the twenties and thirties, among which names such as Frings, Kranzmayer, Maurer, Mitzka, E. Schwarz, Steinbach, Teuchert figure most prominently. In the process of viewing language and history together, through the utilization of the

most diverse linguistic material (names, dialects, the language of chanceries, etc.), and through orientation to graphemic/phonemic research and to word-geography, the part taken by language in the process of settling during the high and late Middle Ages has been much better illuminated and the methods for this research greatly refined.

The understanding of the overwhelming significance of the processes of settling for high, late, and post-medieval German language history has greatly increased. It is contrary to the opinions of the twenties and early thirties, which had been formed on the basis of linguistic observations in the German West, and contrary to the older conceptions of the particular significance of the late medieval territories for the formation of speech areas (*Sprachräume*), as well as of the role of language movement without speaker movement, which to some extent plays a role in research even today. Along with this development came a series of modifications and emendations of opinions up to that time; indeed, it even included effects on notions about processes involved in the development of the *Rheinische Fächer*, which are lately placed in the Merovingian-Early Carolingian period.

Language mix and levelling are shown to be fundamental principles in the linguistic history of medieval territorial expansion. For continuing literature cf. Frings (1948); also Steinbach (1952); H. Kuhn (1951–52); Große and Protze (1956); Kranzmayer (1956); E. Schwarz (1957b, 1961, 1962); Mitzka (1959); Schützeichel (1961); Jansma and Laur (1964); A. Bach (1965); de Smet (1965); Bischoff (1966, 1967); Steger (1968).

A worthwhile goal is the consideration of the interrelationships of mix in a background of phonological and morphological (and syntactic) systems and subsystems, in order that the situation at the point of departure as well as the results of levelling may be better evaluated. An attempt to do this was undertaken, for example, by R. Große (1960), H. Singer in Maurer (1965), Steger (1965, 1968).

1.2.6 *Language of Documents, Literary Regions*

Historical research has made considerable progress in working with the high and late medieval as well as with the early modern literary regions. Scholars have methodically examined the most diverse material, the neglect of which had called results of earlier research into question; thus for example the separation of the writers, the transition from a method which considers isolated points to one which considers broader areas in studying linguistic geography, the study of cultural transmission with a view to origins and political and cultural interweaving: Klappenbach (1945); Maurer (1956); de Boor and Haacke (1957); W. Kleiber and G. Meissburger in Maurer (1965).

Independent research on the language of documents has been advanced for almost all regions since 1945; methodological acuteness is demonstrated in varying degrees. We do not distinguish between grammatical and historical studies here. *General studies*: Nordin (1945); H. Bach (1955); Kirchhoff (1957); Cordes (1959); McLintock (1961); Besch (1964, 1968). For *Alemannic*: Boesch (1946, 1968); Schmid (1953): St. Gallen; Rexroth (1959–60): Konstanz; Stolzenberg (1961–62): Upper Rhine; Boesch

(1968). For *Bavarian*: Pfanner (1954): Nuremberg; Woronow (1962): Nuremberg and Augsburg; Haacke (1964): Nuremberg; Strebl (1967): Klosterneuburg. For the *Rhineland*: Schützeichel (1956): Mittelrhein; Schwitzgebel (1958): Ingelheim; Schützeichel (1962): Cologne. For *Thuringian-Saxon*: Hammerschmidt (1948): Jena; Kettmann (1967a): Kursächsisch; Kettmann (1967b): Wittenberg; Ahlsson (1965); Fleischer (1965a): Dresden; Suchsland (1965), Fleischer (1965a): Jena: Bohemia and Moravia: Rainer (1962): Southern Bohemia; Skála (1962): Eger; Gardonyi (1965): Schemnitz and Kremnitz; Masařik (1966): Central Moravia; Gardonyi (1966): Schmöllnitz.

Besides studies dealing with special problems by Kirk (1923), Burdach (1926, 1932, 1934, 1935), Bebermeyer (1929), E. Schwarz (1936), Schmitt (1936), Hg. Moser (1950–51, 1951), E. Ising (1960) and others, there are three comprehensive studies (which give evidence of methodological maturity) on the history of the written language and on the German language regions in the late Middle Ages. These three form a culmination of such study for the present: Maurer (1965); Schmitt (1966); Besch (1967).

The studies and preliminary works published by Maurer for the purposes of plumbing southwest German language history more deeply provide a fruitful discussion of methods, give a survey of the position of research, and outline the contours of the work still underway in Freiburg. With the help of a group of sources which can be precisely classified as to time and area (and, perhaps, sociologically as well), the project intends to clarify, in particular, the geographical problems of southwest German language history. Land registers and lists of property of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries make up this group of sources. There is no doubt that with this material the best provisions have been made for the solution of the problems posed. Twenty-one extensive sets of material have already been analyzed and the whole is now being compiled. The greatest difficulties of such an undertaking lie in the search for a linguistic interpretation of the written language. There are extraordinary difficulties involved in bringing the emerging written norms to bear on the system of language which underlies them, and only when this is achieved can the history of writing lead to the history of language; one cannot hope to solve the problem satisfactorily without the most precise knowledge of the dialects of today. For this reason, among others, a southwest German language atlas is now being planned in Freiburg.

Schmitt's work (1966), which for the most part still derives from the thirties and forties and is only now being published, gives very particular emphasis to a new methodological aspect — the sociology of the transmitters of the written language: their origin, their involvement in political and cultural actualities, their position in the structure of the chancery. A fascinating picture of the written reality arises from a great abundance of observations of the most diverse provenance, which, however, raises the question of whether or not it is at all possible to penetrate, in this way, the 'language', the always unique, closed system of communication where a fluctuating profusion of mixtures and interweavings in the graphemic and sociological sphere dissolves the outlines. The circle of tradition, the group of writers, becomes, in Schmitt's painstaking method of investigation, the smallest unit which can be ob-

served. The urgent question which remains is whether or not it can be assumed that their written evidence reflects a unified 'structure'.

In many respects, methodological acuity most particularly distinguishes the third great study of the last years: Besch's *Sprachlandschaften und Sprachausgleich im 15. Jh.* (1967). In this work, most of the methodological challenges of recent decades are met, and this leads to a rigorous questioning of the conclusions of, above all, the Leipzig and earlier Prague schools (Frings and Schwarz, respectively), which had, until then, been widely recognized and which see the sources of the New High German literary language in the Upper Saxon *Neusiedelland.* Besch now shows, in 48 manuscripts of a late fourteenth century work which are widely scattered in their origins, that the interpretation of his indeed very limited, but extremely promising group of sources points to the hypothesis that the source of the New High German literary language is not merely a product of the Upper Saxon dialect region, but that it arose from the fusion of East Middle German and East Upper German, and that its later development was furthered by nearly all the significant linguistic areas. Besch is not entirely without predecessors in this view. One may well wait in suspense to see whether or not this conclusion can be corroborated by other material and with stricter attention to the structural problems.

But consequently, the long-neglected topic of Early New High German has become very much more widely known in recent years.

1.2.7 *Onomastics*

Research in the area of Middle High German names, the history of which is an important part of language history, has also received a fresh impetus.

In brief, then, for the most part work is proceeding along the well-established paths of the philological-historical method, which is of highest and lasting value for the purposes of etymological explanation and historical classification. The study of place names has considerably advanced in all regions. The particular achievements of the study of names of rivers are, to be sure, in the area of the oldest language history, but even for the Middle High German period it continues to yield new information. The study of personal names has, besides providing new materials, set new emphases; this by dint of closer attention to the appearance of saints' names (where geographical problems play a role, too) and by means of studies on the origin of personal names in the later Middle Ages.

In many places the preliminary work for a revision of the *Altdeutsches Namenbuch* (Foerstemann 1856–72), which is being done again from the sources, has progressed very well. One center in Freiburg is just now beginning to put material (first of all for place names) into central archives, and is preparing to produce articles on names which, again, are to be classified according to tribes; several indexes are to be included. The work will extend up to the year 1200. Beyond this, a number of books on regional names, which lead up to the modern period, are being produced.

Since the study of names has become a very independent branch of linguistics, only

the continuing resources are named here, in order that our presentation not be overburdened.

For the study of names and its literature cf. Schwarz (1949–56, 1957a); Bach (1952–56); Eichler (1962, 1963ff.); *Onoma* 1–13 and the important reports in *Blätter für Landeskunde* by Schützeichel, who is also the new editor of the *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* (*BNF*).

Experiments in the structural treatment of names have been done by Leys (1965, 1966, 1967) and Debus (1966).

1.3 *Further Areas of Study*

1.3.1 *Stylistics*

Stylistics in Middle High German has repeatedly been the object of scholarly research. Cf. for example Gräff (1946); Green (1949); Kranzmayer (1950); van der Lee (1950); F.R. Schröder (1950–51); Wildermuth (1952); Müller (1953); Stackmann (1955, 1958); Gernentz (1960); Baeuml (1960); W.J. Schröder (1960); Endres (1961); Lippka (1963); Bayer (1962).

Especially important are Horacek's various contributions to stylistics (and to *inhaltsbezogene Grammatik*) (Horacek 1964) of the Middle High German poetic language with their emphasis on semantic problems.

Now just as formerly, research on Middle High German style vacillates between the search for ancient stylistic forms and literary interpretations and grammatical and historical interpretations. On the whole, we lack a sharply-defined conception of style as a linguistic phenomenon, in contrast to grammar and to language history, but also in contrast to the form assumed by literary stylistics. Singer offers a good beginning in *Maurer-Festschrift* (1968).

1.3.2 *Independent Language: Old Yiddish*

A special source of material from the Middle High German period has entered our horizon with the discovery of the Old Yiddish Cambridge manuscript T.-S. 10.K22, which contains, among other things, the *Dukus Horant*. It poses particular linguistic problems, the investigation of which has only just begun. Neumann (1960); Birnbaum (1961); S.A. Wolf (1962–64); Weissberg (1963, 1965); W. Schwarz (1966); Röll (1966).

2. NEW HIGH GERMAN

2.0 *Introduction*

The treatment of current trends in the scientific study of New High German faces a rather complex task, for the diversity of the methods and the multiplicity of the objects

dealt with are considerable. Also, during recent years linguistics in the narrower sense has developed rapidly.

Therefore, it is advisable for New High German, in contrast to the treatment of Middle High German, to place the most weight on the presentation of grammatical problems and to restrict oneself greatly as concerns language history, and, further, to cite only the summarizing literature. This procedure seems best also because, up until now, a considerable number of language histories have been available, but hardly any summaries of scholarly work in linguistics for the German language. Some additional problems of paralinguistics (sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, stylistics) are included in the second section (2.2).

2.1 *Grammar and Lexicology*

2.1.0 *Historical Grammar*

The explaining of speech and parts of speech could, from the historical angle of vision in the waning nineteenth and in the twentieth centuries, mean only seeking to determine its source, observing its origin, and describing its development.

On the basis of this intention and with the help of the comparative method, the nineteenth century succeeded in uncovering relationships between and connections among the languages of the world, and in reconstructing their common 'sources'. It is obvious that, first of all, the inflectional morphemes, the lexemes, and the phonemes or their representative graphemes and sequences of graphemes, presented themselves for study. Since the greatest interest was directed towards the oldest stages of language, towards dead written languages, the history of their individual elements could be investigated without taking the problems of the sentence or even of the text into closer scrutiny. But naturally, syntax was, at last, to be historically explained; that which is at hand as something that has come into being; that which is at hand also as something continually changing.

The intensive preoccupation with the problems of linguistic history produced a methodological gain and an abundance of new material and new observations, which arose in connection with the discussion of methods — the rapidly spreading 'positivist' natural sciences in the second half of the nineteenth century. The most gifted of an entire generation were formed along the lines of the questions contiguous to this: the school of the Neo-Grammarians arose. E. Sievers, H. Paul, W. Braune, and O. Behaghel are its most important representatives. They also continued to work and to influence scholarship until well into the time we describe. They wanted to treat language on the new basis of positive understanding: observing, describing, and explaining rationally. '*Lautlehre*' (phonology) now comes into the foreground. The historical point of view is maintained. The necessity for starting from the whole of language, at least from 'texts' of oral or written variety, and of eliciting grammar from sentences, was more and more lost from view in the language science of this period. Elements of language had become very isolated objects of research, and the grammar

was, as it were, constructed from the bottom up, from '*Laut*' to '*Wort*' to '*Satz*'.

In addition to this, psychology, which was just then rapidly evolving and which had not yet found its methodological security, believed it had found one of its richest sources in language, and linguists showed themselves to be overwhelmingly influenced by a mentalistic way of thinking.

The atomistic way of looking at things just described brought with it as a consequence the fact that even for the word, problems of distribution were only rarely examined, although they had come up relatively early in historical phonology. Thus this problem, too, was not systematically thought through nor were its consequences seen until very much later.

Between the First and Second World Wars, the Neo-Grammarians and their disciples took over the leading role in German linguistics, particularly in *Germanistik* at the universities. The study of New High German grammar and language history was formed by them but remains, on the whole, quite scanty. Dialect geography and a trend more towards the history of ideas (cf. 2.2) come rapidly into the foreground as a new branch of linguistics. On the whole, the balance shifts in favor of the historical, during which process many positivistic, rational bents were abandoned and were replaced by a kind of irrationalism.

During the period under discussion, two major works appeared: Hermann Paul's *Deutsche Grammatik* (1916–20), on the whole an unintelligible presentation of New High German grammar on a historical basis, and Otto Behaghel's four-volume *Deutsche Syntax* (1923–32), which closed the gaps in the treatment of historical grammar which had existed until then, for Jakob Grimm had left his German grammar uncompleted, breaking off after the treatment of the simple sentence. In his writing, Behaghel sees himself to some extent opposed to Grimm and also to Paul, who had collected data, while Behaghel wanted to study the development of regularities. Ludwig Sütterlin's *Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuhochdeutschen Mundarten* did not appear beyond the first volume (*Lautverhältnisse, Wortbiegung*) (1924). Even in the view of the later Neo-Grammarians this work was felt to be unsatisfactory, and his contemporaries express their opinion: 'To be sure, he accomplished a great deal; he mastered an enormous mass of material and in many cases gave good explanations of details. But his grammar is essentially a grammar of dialects, not a history of the evolution of our literary language' (Arntz 1934–91). At the same time we see in this what a grammar at that time was supposed to be.

Nor did Karstien's *Historische Grammatik* (1939) appear beyond the historical introduction and the phonology. It is a study of phonological phenomena in longitudinal sections from Proto-Germanic to New High German.

Stolte (1951) gives a clear and concise outline of the conclusions of Paul's five-volume *Deutsche Grammatik*. Ingrid Dal's *Kurze Deutsche Syntax* (1952) is also written in large part from the point of view of the Neo-Grammarians. The same is true of Richard Kienle's *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Deutschen* (1960), which also treats the most important historical problems of New High German.

As a consequence of the historical approach with its relativism and because of the lack of separation in linguistic theory between *langue* and *parole*, scholars came more and more to neglect, indeed, to scorn the problems of the norm in the literary language: the 'natural growth' of the language was not to be hindered in any way (Steger 1964a, 1967a:264, 1967b). Because of this view, dialects become the focal point, since they are considered to have developed naturally. The standard language, especially in the form it has had since the nineteenth century, is often considered to be to too great an extent artificially over-formed.

Only Germanists in other countries retained the view that the norms fixed by the speech community are a central component of the language which must not be abandoned on account of an individualistically-conceived thesis of development. Thus, for example, Jan van Dam's *Handbuch des Deutschen* (1937–40) has a good, stabilizing effect.

The theory that all description of language must be historical has penetrated so completely that its supporters no longer notice that it is, after all, a theoretical hypothesis; otherwise Behaghel (1923–32), for example, could not maintain his alienation from theory and appeal to the 'facts'. They hardly realized that, with the explanation of historical relationships of forms and meanings, nothing is proved about the functioning of the linguistic systems and nothing about the fluctuation between form and meaning. According to the basic positivist position, the acts of speech, the 'material' with all that is random and incidental, theoretically received the entire stress.

Where the basic historical theory did not fit, as for example in the elucidation of grammatical relationships within the sentence, other theories or prejudices took over. These might be of a psycholinguistic nature as in Paul (Paul 1920:121) or 'pure, arbitrary setting down of thoughts', which, for example, Behaghel drew 'from his own comprehension of the New High German language and a rather gross psychology or logic' (Glinz 1967:52).

Therefore one is not astonished even by statements such as Paul's that it is the task of syntax as a part of semantics 'to demonstrate how the individual words are fitted together for the purpose of communication' (Paul 1916–20, Vol. 3:3). Consequently, one must arrive at concepts such as the 'psychological subject' and the 'psychological predicate'.

The third edition of Hermann Wunderlich's book *Deutscher Satzbau* (first edition 1892, third edition 1924), revised by Hans Reis (Wunderlich and Reis 1924–25), shows very clearly the shifting of balance in favor of the historical and the inclusion of a broad irrational tendency. Glinz (1967:46) called it '*psychologisch-allhistorisch*', and that is exactly what it is; the systematic descriptive tendencies of the Neo-Grammarians retreat even farther in favor of 'interpretation', which begins even with the introduction of German nomenclature, which is made the starting point for a Germanizing national chauvinism. One notices clearly that the author wants to do more than write a grammar, for he expands the introduction extraordinarily and claims to offer a complete theory of language and language history, which, however, he does

not base on empiricism, but which he deduces, over and over again, from general psychological, indeed 'ontological' (in a very problematic sense) concepts. On the other hand, the sections which deal with grammar in the narrower sense are very much more carefully taken over from the original author, even though they are in part rearranged, and contain a blending of the historical approach with K. F. Becker's (1830, 1855) conception of clauses. There is the advantage that Wunderlich takes oral tradition, the colloquial speech with which he was concerned in his own book, as his point of departure.

Individual studies with a historical view of New High German can be treated here only in the most narrow selection. Phonology is omitted, since the scientific studies are quite overwhelmingly concerned with older stages of the language.

On the topic of word-formation, we are indebted to the historical school for important studies; for example Friedrich Kluge's *Nominale Stammbildungslehre*, which appears in 1926 in the third edition. This work, however, is directed primarily towards the oldest period. Kluge's *Abriss der deutschen Wortbildungslehre* (1925a), on the other hand, takes the newer period into closer consideration. Altogether, this work does not go into the classification and tracing of the history of external forms, and this is quite overwhelmingly true also for *Deutsche Wortbildung* by Walter Henzen (1965), which is nowadays very well-known. Cf. also Szadrowsky (1926–27).

The studies on word order are important from the point of view of language-history. Maurer in particular worked during the twenties with the position of verbs (Maurer 1924, 1926). Later Biener treated this problem several times (Biener 1926). Until the more modern period, scholars were concerned with the problems of verbal analytic forms from the point of view of language history; however, as is to be expected, more recent methodological developments and insights have been incorporated to some extent. Cf. for example Guchmann (1961), W. Schröder (1959a, "*würde* plus Infinitivgefüge"), Lang (1961), Werner (1965, subjunctive), Henzen (1959, "Systematik der infiniten Verbalformen"). Cf. also Hempel's article "Über Bedeutung und Ausdruckswert der deutschen Vergangenheitstempora" (in M. Hempel 1966).

Other studies are concerned for example with the alterations in the use of verbal prefixes in the eighteenth century (Kayser 1950), with inversion (Hagström 1952, Spitzer 1958) and with the passive (Renicke 1957).

Very much under the influence of the posing of synchronic and semantic questions are the studies by Flämig on the *Konjunktiv* (1959), and the verb (1964), by Kempcke (1965, 1966) on the "verbalen Kompositionspartikeln *an-* und *auf*", and by Wells (1964) on the suffix *-heit*. Eggers studies alterations in German sentence structure (1961); Wolff considers the connection between the "Rückgang des Genitivs und die Verkümmerung der partitiven Denkformen" (Wolff 1954). From among Oehmann's numerous articles, let us select the treatment of the "Pluralformen auf *-s* in der deutschen Substantivflexion" (1962). Erben's outline "Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kollektiva" (1959) may be cited from his historical grammatical study of New High German.

One must realize that academic linguistic instruction in German studies at the university level proceeded until well into the sixties almost exclusively on the basis of language history and the theories of the Neo-Grammarians. The older stages of the German language up to Middle High German were the center of attention, and the concern was primarily with historical phonology and morphology. A study of the records of university lectures in Germany shows that syntactic and semantic problems were neglected for years at a time, and, as far as I can see, only the syntax of the Neo-Grammarians was taught at all in German institutions of higher education until well into the fifties. Up until the most recent period, the Germanist left the university without acquaintance with syntactic problems of the living standard language and without methods of research suitable for this problem.

2.1.1 *Synchronic Grammar of the First Third of the Twentieth Century*

It is clear that German schools never accepted historical grammar. Even though the school was concerned with keeping in contact with the problems which were affecting scientific endeavor of the time, neither historical phonology and morphology nor historical syntax could meet its needs. What it wanted had always to be a description and explanation of the contemporary, valid system of language. Whether it was conceived as a *Lernschule* or *Arbeitsschule*, it had to work normatively.

The profession considered this to be a practical problem with which it need not concern itself; it would seem that it also considered the problem solved or easily soluble.

The only description of the German language which corresponded to the objective requirements of the German schools was the study of clauses by K. F. Becker (1830, 1855) in the first half of the nineteenth century. Its basic conception came from the idea of Nature's highest antithesis between *Tätigkeit* and *Geist* or between *Sein* and *Materie*. Its conception of a difference between the logical (with respect to content) side of linguistic symbols and the phonetic side led to a binary system of ramifications on both sides, which 'in the last analysis explains all subdivisions of language as members of some antithesis or other, which in its turn forms a higher and simpler antithesis with a second pair of antitheses until the whole is brought back to the original antithesis' (Glinz 1947:44). Becker, whose ideas recently were again critically presented by Glinz (1947:42–53) and Haselbach (1966) and who deserves attention even today, has been devastatingly criticized by the blossoming historical school of the nineteenth century, which was, to a great extent, far-removed from problems of logic. In particular, R. von Raumer and H. Steinthal destroyed his scientific reputation so effectively that he, the creator of the grammar which despite all the historical schooling of Germanists was to dominate the German school system for 100 years, is not even mentioned in Stroh's *Handbuch der germanischen Philologie* (1952).

The school grammars, however, accept his theory of sentence parts and include in at most a few chapters some elements of historical phonology and morphology, for example, on vowel-gradation (*Ablaut*). In this way the system is carried on up to our

time. It is still especially important for our period that, in addition to numerous school grammars in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, Bauer's *Grammatik* (which has been revised by Konrad Duden, the creator of the authoritative *Rechtschreibwörterbuch*) since the eighteenth edition has been based on Becker's system. Because of the *Rechtschreibduden*, which has received universal favor, the Duden *Grammatik* is gaining a very good reputation. 'Thus Becker's theory of clauses enjoyed the attainment of a certain official dignity. Especially since 1935, when the old Bauer-Duden grammar, revised by Otto Basler, was republished as a part of the *Grosser Duden* has it been thought of in many places as the official handbook' (Glinz 1947:69).

The system used by the school grammars becomes such a solid part of an individual's education that its use is virtually a matter of course in almost all places where the goal is a descriptive grammar.

Before the First World War, Curme's very 'complete' *Deutsche Grammatik*, packed with material, had been produced, reappearing in a completely revised edition in 1922. It made modern language usage the central issue, but on the other hand also considered the historical view indispensable — particularly with regard to the proper understanding of and the correct use of various levels of style. This is an argument one often hears even today; I however am of the opinion that the problem should be solved differently.

Curme's grammatical theory, too, is based on the system of the school grammars, and only occasionally does he free himself from it; namely when contrasting observations from English offer him a different approach.

John Ries' studies in syntax, which were produced at the end of the nineteenth century, were reissued in 1927 and gave a critical survey of the current interpretations of this topic. Ries himself proceeds from a conception of grammar as a closed system in which syntax assumes a definite theoretical status. He makes clear to how great an extent the problem of syntax is defined by the older logical definition of a sentence, which is not derived from the description of formal criteria. 'Phonology, morphemics, and syntax are parts of the grammar as a whole. These parts originate because we divide human speech into its component parts, then separate them out as individual objects of research and classify them according to the magnitude of their units. Morphology and semantics, on the other hand, are nothing more than the result of different ways of looking at the same objects of research. They are investigated from various points of view — now the phonological, now the semantic; once as to form, once as to content. In the case of syntax and semantics, we have to do with an intersecting distribution of the objects themselves, which is in one instance caused by the differences among the objects themselves and in the other by a difference in the ways of looking at the same objects' (Ries 1927:46ff.).

2.1.2 *'Ganzheitliche Sprachbetrachtung' and 'inhaltsbezogene Grammatik': A German Branch of Structuralism*

While historical grammatical research and academic instruction continued un-

perturbed along the old lines and school grammars continued to be contented with numerous variations on Becker's system, which was scorned by the professionals, a new linguistic concept arose. It was inspired by Ferdinand de Saussure and in part influenced by Wilhelm von Humboldt, by the philosophy of the twenties (the 'Ganzheits-Struktur-Gestalt' school of psychology), as well as by a national reassessment of many aspects of intellectual life.

'Der neue Sprachbegriff ist ganzheitlich bestimmt, und die auf ihm beruhende Bedeutungslehre ist der vom phonologischen Standpunkt aus betrachteten Lautlehre, die im Gegensatz zu der atomistischen Einstellung immer auf die sinnvolle Umgliederung des phonologischen Gefüges gerichtet ist, methodologisch verwandt... Die Bedeutungsleistungen der Sprachen lassen sich nur in den sprachlichen Ganzheiten vergleichen. Nachdem es den ersten neuen Fragestellungen (z.B. Weisgerbers) noch an Methode mangelte, ist folgerichtig aus dem Organismus-Begriff, zumal der Saussureschen System-Lehre, nach der die Sprachbedeutungen durch "Wert" begründet werden und sich innerhalb eines Ganzen durch den Unterschied wesentlich selbst bestimmen, der methodische Begriff des *Bedeutungsfeldes*, des Wortfeldes oder sprachlichen Zeichenfeldes, erwachsen, der "Gliederungseinheiten zwischen dem Ganzen der Sprache überhaupt und den einzelnen Wörtern und Formen" (Trier 1931:418), nämlich der Gesamtheit aller zum gleichen Sinnbezirk gehörenden Worte' (Stroh 1934:240).

Interpretation of the language as a whole: F.N. Finck 1899; cf. Ipsen 1930, 1932; Schürr 1923; Freyer 1927; O. Funke in Marty 1926; Weisgerber 1926; Porzig 1923; Leopold 1929; Morsbach 1931; Schwinger 1934; *Sprache und Bedeutung* 1930; Saleski 1926).

Research in semantics and in syntax: The sentence as the smallest independent form of expression; emphasis on the immutability of the always personal shape of sound and form of activity in the text; the mother-tongue as a 'socially-determined creation of a distinct inner form, which directs the members of the speech community in thinking, even in acting (L. Weisgerber and G. Schmidt-Rohr 1933)' (Arens 1955: 423) — these are the key phrases of the new branch of German linguistics in the twenties, which sees itself as continuing in the contexts of historical linguistic description in other respects.

The scholarly trend appearing here led to a specifically German form of structuralism, which one can associate in its beginnings with the names Leo Weisgerber, Walter Porzig, Jost Trier, Gunter Ipsen, and some others. It at once connects the idea of *System* with the problem of meaning — with the inner form. From the very beginning it follows Humboldt's allusion to the creativity of language, the *energeia.* Thus originated the fundamentals of the later so-called 'inhaltsbezogene Grammatik', which gained considerable influence in Germany after 1945.

Among its basic hypotheses is the notion that the structure of thought and therefore the entire relationship to the world (*Weltbild*) is determined by the always individual structure of specific languages. Therefore the speech community must necessarily

attain to a central position in this theory, which thereby assumes a strongly socio-linguistic component.

It is evident that the acceptance of semantics into the problems of grammar and the emphasis of the creativity of language were fundamentally of central, forward-looking significance. On the question of the *Weltbild* created by the native tongue, however, depends in part the question of the place which language and therefore also linguistics occupy within the system of the universe.

In addition to its strengths, however, early German structuralism shows decided weaknesses, which it only imperfectly overcomes in the course of its later development.

Thus it neglects, during the thirties and forties, to develop strict, methodological, descriptive principles and procedures, which could make explicit the description of language and in particular the transition from description of the external form to the analysis of internal form. Nor does it achieve the formulation of the details of a theory of linguistic analysis in which the individual descriptive acts are given their places in the completion of the process of analysis. The question of where semantic analysis must be included, of what a semantic analysis can ever be, beyond a naive 'comprehension of meaning' and of how semantics and syntax are interrelated, of how the problems of content and expression should be limited, what function word-formation has in the model — all such questions remain unclear.

In retrospect, Arens evaluates (a little too severely, but essentially correctly) the early stages (the twenties and thirties) of this structural approach to language: 'The problems of the meaning of the sentence, of inner form, which are attacked again and again during this period, are so complicated that a definitive solution either cannot be found at all or can be arrived at only with revised hypotheses. It is perhaps characteristic for Germany that its linguistic efforts are all of a philosophical nature to a greater or lesser degree, which is hardly effective when the linguists do not have the proper tools at their disposal, yet, on the other hand, they offer many possibilities for serious speculation' (Arens 1955:423).

The lack of explicitness in these statements makes a check on the 'results' as well as their systematic continuation very difficult, so that for a long time details of linguistic analysis underwent no progressive revision, since scholars considered the whole theory over and over again. Only thus is it possible that *inhaltsbezogene Grammatik* even of the fifties and sixties confuses the level of content and the level of expression (*Inhalts-u. Ausdrucksebene*) (a problem that Louis Hjelmslev had illuminated as early as the forties) and that therefore their alleged content-relationships are misleading (Stötzel 1969, ch. 5).

The native tongue concept was used in the late thirties to create a point of departure for superseding the older school-grammar. 'For German instruction for native speakers as well as for the teaching of German as a foreign language, the first necessity nowadays is to free ourselves from the approaches of Latin grammar; the construction of a description and statement of rules in the nature of the German language is necessary' (Drach 1940:6). For Drach follows the basing of a theory of syntax on the

observation of 'actually-occurring verbalization' (*Lebenswirkliches Sprechdenken*) (1940:7).

On the one hand, it becomes clear that a conglomerate of the most widely differing approaches is included in the incipient new grammar: problems of content and expression, grammatical and sociological problems are intermingled. The terminology is often taken literally.

On the other hand, a beginning had been made with the revival of a synchronic school-grammar, and discussion flourished, pursued especially by school officials such as Pfleiderer (1940; 1959 = Moser 1965), Rahn (1940), Boost (1955). But not until after the war is there broader scientific discussion and from the tenets of this structural approach to language is produced the later so-called *inhaltsbezogene Grammatik*. Its most characteristic representatives are Hennig Brinkmann, Johannes Erben, Hans Glinz, Paul Grebe, the Duden-staff, and, of course, Leo Weisgerber. Hugo Moser works in a more strictly historical tradition, although he takes these principles into consideration. It is characteristic of the group that they do not apply themselves to the systematic development of one unified methodological and theoretical concept, but that almost all prominent members, with widely differing methods, which have only relatively few things in common in their emphasis on content-problematics, offer their own attempts at formulation. A joint grammar on a content-based theory, announced some time ago, has not yet appeared. The leading scholar of the group, Leo Weisgerber, sees the problem of theory and method very clearly. To be sure, with few exceptions (cf. Weisgerber 1928, 1955, 1962), he avoids concrete analysis, and is obviously seeking a way 'to grasp the contents of the language directly out of the observation of supra-individual speech competence (*überpersönlicher Sprachbesitz*)' (Glinz 1967:82), whereby he frequently has recourse to the field-concept (cf. for example Weisgerber 1949–50, 1963, 1964b) (cf. also 1.1.3 above). It becomes especially clear that the *langue-parole* problem remains strongly bound to a sociological foundation, which elsewhere in international linguistics has been largely given up.

Weisgerber sees a desirable grammar as having four stages. It ought to proceed from the sound-based description to the content (*Inhaltsbezogenheit*), from there to the output (*Leistungsbezogenheit*), and finally to efficiency (*Wirkungsbezogenheit*). Most of the details for these processes are, however, still unwritten; cf. Weisgerber 1957, 1963, 1964a (*Lit.*), Gipper 1959a (*Lit.*). For a theory of word-formation in four stages cf. Weisgerber 1964c. For content-based word-formation cf. also Henzen (1956, 1958). Some discussion of methods of content-based language research can be found in Grosse 1964; for the concept of the field cf. Hoberg 1969.

On the other hand, Johannes Erben (1961, 1955 = Moser 1965) and Hennig Brinkmann (1962) seem skeptically opposed to the idea that a theoretical model is necessary for the description of a language. For example, Erben (1958) mentions that in the new treatment of syntactic phenomena it is necessary to 'grasp them as they emerge from a natural pole ...' and also 'to break through the intermediate level of the classical categories to the objective facts and to ascertain a terminology suited to

the object'. In addition, Brinkmann introduces his book with the provocative sentence: 'This book is not in servitude to theories, but is striving towards an appropriate description of the object' (Brinkmann 1962: Foreword).

On the basis of such assumptions, one cannot anticipate any study which will assimilate the theoretical realizations of modern linguistics, yet keep the categories and theoretical levels separate. Even diachronic notions are still appearing in places where they certainly do not belong. Cf. Glinz 1967:67, 76, 77.

Yet, in all these authors one can find excellent passages and numerous independent observations which increase our knowledge of the New High German language (especially in the area of performance) and which point out open questions. Both authors proceed from external form and intend to push ahead to output, to content, and are therefore fundamentally empiricists. Cf. also Erben 1964a, 1968, and Brinkmann 1953. In this connection Brinkmann's contribution to the research on the parts of speech is very important (Brinkmann 1951).

In some aspects of *inhaltsbezogene Grammatik* a development parallel to international structuralism can be observed, for example on the valence problem (Erben, Brinkmann, Glinz, Admoni); however, it once again fails to achieve a unified conceptual formulation, as is shown by the newer critical studies by Stötzel (1969) and Heringer (1967, 1969).

Hans Glinz consistently demonstrates a particular consciousness of methodology, which was apparent even in his dissertation, and which is directed especially towards concrete processes in textual analysis. Also, he is always concerned with a secure theoretical formulation. His most important works are still *Die Innere Form des Deutschen* (Glinz 1968) and *Grundbegriffe und Methoden inhaltsbezogener Text- und Sprachanalyse* (Glinz 1965b; cf. also Glinz 1966, 1967).

This author, too, wants a grammar adapted to the peculiar character of the German language. His goal is the description of internal form as conceptual, categorial form, as opposed to the external (= audible, physical) form, 'but yet, simultaneously, as form; that is, as "the totality of the more or less constant structural characteristics" (not as "a totality of content") as Weisgerber (1929) understands it' (Glinz 1968:9). Nor does Glinz follow Weisgerber's four-stage model with its transition to output and efficiency.

In his *Innere Form* he first of all treats exclusively the side of language having to do with expression (and to this extent differs greatly from Weisgerber), employing the operational methods of taxonomic structuralism, which he developed independently twenty years after their origin in America. His experimental procedures are syntactically (and in part content-) oriented, not phonological. As a whole, his work is often approximately in accord with that of Ch.C. Fries, and in *Innere Form* the problems which are actually semantic are still excluded; it is a taxonomic syntax. He modifies the concept of system by 'regarding language fundamentally as a historically stratified and therefore never entirely "pure" system', as a 'socially determined creation' to which he attributes a logically systematic and a creatively free component.

Therefore he also consistently turns toward a strict formalization (he likes to speak of a similarity with mathematics) of grammar. It must be realized, however, that the problems of statics and dynamics can be neither separated nor solved in this way, and that the problem of creativity must be integrated into the linguistic model.

His new and sometimes quite complicated terminology seems at first to be quite illustrative, and for this reason he later has great difficulty making clear to his readers that they must regard many of the designations used here only as 'indications of the exact conceptual content which seemed suitable at the time' and not to take them too seriously (Glinz 1968:4). Actually writing an independent grammar of the German language necessitated redefining most of the grammatical concepts as well. In grammatical analysis Glinz keeps to the basic requirement of dissecting a complete text. Tests with informants assure an empirical procedure.

In his later writings, Glinz alters his terminology; seldom however does he make use of any already available terminology, even when it stands for clearly defined concepts corresponding to his own concepts. This makes dealing with his studies much more difficult.

Since 1965 he has separated the area of content and expression as Nomosyntax (and Nomolexicon) and Morphosyntax (and Morpholexicon). To be sure, this is a progression which has been known since Hjelmslev, who can definitively include semantics in his descriptive model. Glinz' book appeared in the same year in which Chomsky's *Aspects* was dealing with this same problem. Since 1965 Glinz has been developing very carefully controlled discovery procedures for the structures and segments of the Nomosphere. A test situation is used throughout for 'analysis of understanding' of whole texts on the basis of 'meaning-bound' replacement and displacement tests, completion sound, and other tests.

Justifiable objections have been raised against his psychologism, among other things (Wunderlich 1968), when he gives the impression, in his analysis of understanding, of wanting to simulate the psychic processes in reality in the hearer-speaker (and therefore, for example, including the memory). At least for the present, one can only hope to delineate the psychic processes as a procedure more adequate for grammar 'in an essentially isomorphic abstract system'. It must also be said that problems of performance are not yet sharply enough separated from problems of competence. For further criticism of his method, among other things, and of the classes of transformation-bound systems (TbS-classes) from the standpoint of a generativist, cf. Wunderlich 1968b. Heringer 1969 and Stötzel 1969 criticize from a more dependential view.

Even in the face of justified objections, however, one must recognize that Glinz is one of the most original and methodologically most aware grammarians of the German language.

The Duden *Grammatik* (Duden 1966), edited in 1959 under the direction of Paul Grebe, is fundamentally a 'national grammar', which enjoys something akin to official recognition in Germany. This book summarizes German scholarship insofar

as it is *inhaltsbezogen* by taking over those conclusions which seem certain and retaining the older system in other cases. This grammar offers an extraordinary amount of material. It can in many respects be said to be complete. However, things are not placed within the framework of an overlapping model. At the time of the *Duden*'s appearance, Grebe's 'sentence structure plans' were an especially important inventory of the patterns of superficial sentence structures, which were at that time, however, still interpreted as content-units. In the meantime, this problem has been further pursued by various scholars: Engel (1967, 1969), Kaufmann (1967), Glinz (1965b:45).

In the second edition of the Duden *Grammatik*, Grebe also treated the valence problem and questions of interdependence in connection with Porzig (1934); cf. also Grebe (1966).

There are comparable criteria for the fine grammar by Schulz and Griesbach (1966). An introduction to the various trends in research of German grammar is given by W. Schmidt (1965); Glinz (1967) discusses problems of method in German syntax, which he appraises in close connection to his point of view and his own studies.

Very many contributions on diverse levels have been produced in numerous independent studies of *inhaltsbezogene Grammatik*.

2.1.3 *Structural Grammar*

The structuralism developed outside of Germany has not shown a broader effect in Germany and for the German language until relatively recently. On its history, cf. Bierwisch (1966a), Baumgärtner (1969b in Steger 1970).

The taxonomic structuralism developed in Prague and in America led to no descriptive grammar in Germany, but Glinz (cf. under 2.1.2) has independently re-created the operational methods for the syntax of the German language.

In the area of phonology, there have been studies by the Prague Circle on particular problems of New High German ever since the thirties (cf. for example Vachek 1964, Cercle linguistique de Prague 1929–39, Trost 1939) and in America (cf. for example the studies on German in Joos (1957) and Bloomfield on /x/-/ç/ (1930) and on /k/ in initial position (1938)).

After the war a lively discussion developed on the question of the phonological value of the German affricates, which Martinet had begun as early as 1939 and took up once again in 1949; Hintze (1950), Gerhardt (1952), Forchhammer (1953), Becker (1953), Morciniec (1958, 1960a and b), Merlingen (1960), and Trost (1966) took part.

Several scholars decided to evaluate [ts] and [pf] monophonematically, although there are difficulties here, since the exchange tests show that [pf] is to be understood as biphonematic. Yet, for reasons of parallelism, this sequence [pf] is regarded by many as the realization of a single phoneme. The /x/-/ç/ problem has been further discussed, too; cf. Bloomfield (1930), Leopold (1948), Dietrich (1953), Trost (1958), Lüdtke (1959), Pilch (1964). The entire system of the phonemes is treated, for example, by Heike (1961 in Steger 1970), Moulton (1961), Pilch (1966). Cf. also Gerhardt (1950).

Even statistical questions with regard to phoneme frequency in German (e.g. King 1966, Heike 1967) and the suprasegmental features receive their share of attention (Antonsen 1966). On the relationship between pronunciation and phoneme-system cf. Bithell (1952) and Ochiai (1966).

In the area of morphosyntax, American (cf. Clifford 1965) and above all Scandinavian scholars such as Bech, Ulvestad, Saltveit, and recently Lindgren have produced important structural studies which have appreciably furthered discussion even when they were not accepted by scholars: Saltveit (1956–57, 1960, 1962, 1968); Bech (1955, 1963a and b); Ulvestad (1956, 1960 = German Steger 1970); Wood (1948); Lloyd (1962), Folsom (1961), Stopp (1957), Vail (1952), Lindgren (1966, 1967), Aldenhoff (1961), Halle (1953).

In Bech's work strong influences of the Hjelmslev-school become clear. For a long time this school showed no immediate effect in Germany, but, with the more recent frame of transformational grammar, it has now gained considerable attention (cf. Bierwisch 1965, 1966b). Stötzel (1969) exerts a decided influence in connection with his discussion of methods as concerns reflexive verbs.

French structuralism has found an important advocate for German structuralism in Jean Fourquet, the editor of Lucien Tesnière's posthumous *Elements de syntaxe structurale* (1959) (cf. Fourquet 1938). His *Grammaire d'Allemand* (Fourquet 1965) is kept brief and is attuned primarily to the needs of academic instruction in France. Cf. also Fourquet in Gipper (1959a) and Fourquet (1965 in Steger 1970). In 1969, very interesting prolegomena for a German grammar by Fourquet will appear — this is now in press. Fourquet's students also contribute a great deal to the discussion of German structuralism.

Since the sixties, the generative theory of grammar, developed primarily by Chomsky, has been gaining acceptance at the 'Arbeitsstelle für Strukturelle Grammatik' at the Berlin Academy of Sciences. For particulars on this topic cf. Bierwisch in this volume, and let a brief survey suffice here.

Primarily the volumes published in *Studia Grammatica*, but numerous other studies of this group as well, were intended to assist in the preliminary study for a complete scientific grammar of German on a transformational generative basis. The most important representatives of this group are Manfred Bierwisch, Wolfgang Motsch, Karl Erich Heidolph, and Wolfdietrich Hartung.

The group is actively and productively elaborating on the theory of grammar. The earlier studies (especially Bierwisch 1961, 1962; Motsch 1962, 1964; Heidolph 1966 in Steger 1970; Hartung 1964) are applying the model as Chomsky had developed it in *Syntactic structures* (1957) to the German language and are improving it. A constituent-structure component is being supplemented by a transformational component which, besides transformational rules for the generation of surface structures, also provides embedding transformations for complex sentences, which could not be handled by the older constituent structure analysis. Semantics is not yet included in the description. After 1965 the group takes over the revised trans-

formational theory of grammar, extends it, and is visibly taking a greater part in the discussion of semantics as do Fodor and Katz (1964 = German, Steger 1970), among others. It found further supporters in Bolinger, Halle, Postal, and above all Uriel Weinreich (*Current Trends in Linguistics*, Vol. 3). Cf. Bierwisch (1965, 1966a, 1966b in Steger 1970, 1967a in Steger 1970, Motsch in Bierwisch-Heidolph 1969, Motsch in Steger 1970). Cf. also the American studies on a transformational grammar of German, for example Emmon Bach's treatment of the ordering of sentence-elements in a transformational grammar (1962 in Steger 1970) and also Halle (1953).

Outside of the Berlin group, work on a transformational grammar of New High German did not get underway until later, but is developing rapidly now. Lectures on TG were always held at the meetings of the *Societas Linguistica Europaea*, and until 1968 there have been three linguistic colloquies on generative grammar in which papers were read, for example: "Zur Konstituentenstruktur von Nominalsätzen" (Bechert 1968), "Subklassifizierung von deutschen Verben" (Abraham 1968), "Identitäten bei Satzeinbettungen" (Meyer-Ingwerson 1968), "Subordination und Koordination von Sätzen" (Thümmel 1968), "Pragmatik, Sprechsituation, Deixis" (Wunderlich 1968b).

At a relatively early stage of TG Heinz Vater's book on the syntax of the article in German appeared (Vater 1963). Later he adopted the newer theory of TG as well, as in his important (although, to be sure, not without errors in the first version) study on the deep structure of German Noun Phrases (1967 newly revised version in Steger 1970) and also in an essay on *Pro*-elements (1968).

The 'Papers' of the professorial chair for Linguistics at the University of Stuttgart (Prof. Dr. Klaus Baumgärtner), which have been prepared in mimeographed form since 1967–68, testify to lively activity in the Stuttgart group. To be found there are, for example, R. Baumgärtner's stimulating lecture on the problem of synaesthesia and linguistic universals (1968); Clement's studies on the explication of restrictive and non-restrictive clauses (1968); Thümmel's essay on the syntagmatic and paradigmatic functions in transformational generative grammar (1968); and Lesot's essay (1968) on the fundamentals of a formal science of linguistic meanings.

In the controversy about the semantics of tense (Gelhaus 1966), which appreciably furthered this very difficult problem (which until then had been most naively treated), Baumgärtner, Kühnast and Wunderlich (1967) and Wunderlich (1968a) were most particularly active.

As research continues to make progress on questions of a model of grammar, and as the theoretical problems which must first be cleared up are shown to be more difficult and more complex, linguistics is forced more and more to deal with problems of philosophy, and particularly of logic.

Therefore we are today, as concerns research in TG, certainly very much farther from the prospect of a complete scientific German grammar than we were seven years ago.

For the present state of knowledge, however, a descriptive summary is urgently needed; equally urgent is application to selected grammars and school grammars,

even if it be only temporary. Some preparations have been made in this direction.

For this reason the studies by Gerhard Nickel and his collaborators on the contrastive analysis of English and German, which are based on TG, are important (Nickel and Wagner 1968).

Through its connection with Humboldt, more recent structuralism has in some points — outside of the central problems of universals, to be sure — come into closer contact with the problems of the German branch of structuralism dealt with under 2.1.2. Studies in transformational generative grammar have, however, the knowledge of the years from the thirties to the fifties behind them, and for this reason are working with a greatly refined method, well-developed conceptual differentiations, and also general formalizations. They are striving to produce the most explicit statements possible. On the one hand, this makes them clearly superior; the system has, however, in the meantime become so very consistent that it also obscures certain of its own weaknesses.

For it must not be overlooked that, in spite of extraordinary progress, many things are still in the very early stages, available only in rough outline. Such questions as those of deep structure and semantic features, of the relationships of hierarchical arrangements of syntactic classes to semantic subclasses, of the ordering of phonology and morphology in the transformational component and especially of dependency structure, etc., are still a long way from a precise formulation.

Klaus Baumgärtner is also working on the basis of TG, but he is trying to implicate the dependency principle as well. He has already proved that it is in a complementary relationship to the hierarchical principle, cf. Baumgärtner (1967, 1969a, 1969b = Steger 1970).

According to his conclusions, a syntactic-semantic base, corresponding to the more recent formulation of TG, generates deep structures of a simpler or a more complex kind on the basis of the same number of classifying rules for abstract elementary sentences. 'These are, in the first place, syntactic structures ... However, at the same time they are semantic structures because they are covered by meaning bearing morphemes [read lexemes] from the lexicon of the language. By means of these lexemes, the lexicon always produces, first of all, definitions of meaning ... and, simultaneously for dominating elements, in particular the verbs, their general definition in context ... These context expressions, however, are *in nuce* the dependency rules of the system' (Baumgärtner 1969a:114). It is significant that Baumgärtner critically considers the European scholarly traditions in linguistics in many of his studies.

Von Polenz, Stötzel, and Heringer depart further from the dependency model of Tesnière.

Von Polenz concerns himself first of all in two papers with derived structures of verbs and adjectives (1968a and b). He further develops the newer structural approaches to word-formation (Marchand 1955a and b; Spycher 1955, 1956, 1957; Motsch 1966, 1967; Fleischer 1965c, 1967; Erben 1964a; Morciniec 1960c; Hundsnurscher 1968) in a logical way. He does so by beginning to approach the elucidation

of derived structures from the point of view of syntax, and is thus preparing the way for the incorporation of structural semantics.

Stötzel (1969) uses the reflexive verbs of the German language as the starting-point for an extensive discussion of theory and methods on the topic of categorial levels, especially of the expression/content-level of a grammar. Here he is influenced by Heringer, among others, and is able to improve on the valence theory. He places the entire problem of reflexive verbs in a new context.

At this time, Heringer (1969) has achieved the most in the way of improving the model of grammar, and at the same time is suggesting essential changes in Chomsky's descriptive model.

Thus, one must admit the validity of his replacing the very mechanical single metalingual predication of the rewrite-rule in the constituent-structure base of Chomsky's grammar (which is based on the theory of IC analysis), since this approach is not well-adapted to the recursiveness in the systems of natural languages. It leads to a multiplicity of *ad hoc* conventions, the introduction of which accomplishes nothing. Heringer works, in the section on constituency, with several metalingual hypotheses and arguments ('complements', 'assertions'), and is therefore able to take into consideration the syntagmatic distribution of elements of classes into 'conjuncts' as well as the paradigmatic subclassification into 'adjuncts'. In addition to the rules for construction, he introduces on the same level expansion restrictions, dependency rules, and lexical rules.

In this way, Heringer is able to introduce, directly at the upper end of the graph, a more flexible rule for the joint occurrence of several sentence constituents on the same level. This has many advantages. Heringer depends on Tesnière for his introduction of obligatory and facultative supplements to the verb, but does modify him.

He reduces the transformational component of Chomsky's grammar which, in the more recent formulation of TG, is supposed to handle only surface problems, since the embedding transformations have been dropped. However, it is not exactly clear how problems of congruence and surface structure, for example in word-order, are to be handled now.

In the section on dependency, he now defines the concept of dependency as a binary relation as concerns expression, with syntactic positions of all stages as arguments, always differentiated according to dependence or interdependence.

Recently Engel (1969) has also submitted an independent study on the description of the structure of German sentences, in which the dependency principle again plays a basic role. He arrives at the extraction of four dependency classes (D-classes), which he then divides into six anaphorization classes (A-classes) as substitution classes.

The class averages as subclasses of A and D-classes are designated as members of a syntactic class (S-classes) 'where the syntactic members are A-elements which at the same time belong to a specific D-class according to their internal activity'.

Engel continues to argue the valence problem. He discusses constituent members (for which he suggests a new terminology) and presents 27 plans of sentence structure

for standard German. Now he no longer sees them as combined patterns of S-classes, 'these once again (simplified) cross-sections from A and D-classes. There is, in every sentence scheme, principally just as much linguistic content as there is anaphorization on the one hand; on the other hand, dependency is contained in all that which relates to content. Further content-features are accidental'.

He continues the structuralists' critique of the previous discussion on incorporating semantics into the grammar. Fodor and Katz (1964 in Steger 1970) are rejected, with sound reason. Engel sees potentially useful approaches in Ch. J. Fillmore; however, he does not include Weinreich's important contribution (1967 in *Current Trends in linguistics* Vol. 3).

A good grammar of the basic word-types in German has been submitted by Kaufmann (1967). It has been methodically thought through and it presents a very comprehensive 'catalog of tendencies in usage' in the area of basic word-types for a punch-card program, and is based on well-founded conclusions of international research and a broad range of material.

On the whole, it is clear that linguistic research on New High German is involved in lively activity and promises a great deal for the future.

2.1.4 *Lexicology*

During the period since the First World War, lexicology for New High German has quite overwhelmingly expanded inherited methods and has, in part, refined them. Objectively, it was to some extent occupied with the continuation and conclusion of works begun earlier and with the revision of older editions of standard dictionaries, although new dictionaries were produced as well.

The most inclusive New High German dictionary in existence, the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* begun by Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm, was completed (1854–1960). It contains references to texts from the sixteenth through the nineteenth century. Immediately after its completion, a revision of the first volumes, now well over 100 years old, was begun.

Hermann Paul's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* has been newly revised by Werner Betz (first edition 1897, fifth edition 1957ff.). His chief goal in the individual articles is the history of meaning. The basic goal has been retained in the revised work as well. While in the older Paul work the classical period of more modern German was altogether in the foreground, now linguistic developments up to the present are given a good deal of consideration. At the same time, however, Goethe's language is given more emphasis.

Friedrich Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache* (1965) has been revised by several people since the First World War. It seeks to establish a connection between etymology and word-history. Recently it has been expanded by numerous references to problems of dialect geography. Even though this work has become increasingly popular, it is nonetheless obvious that it no longer adequately fulfills its chief task. for adavnces in comparative and Indo-European linguistics have

for some time no longer been universally accepted. One must hope for a radical revision of this book soon.

Hans Wehrle's *Deutscher Wortschatz* (1954; first edition 1881) has been available since 1961 in a twelfth, completely revised new edition by Hans Eggers.

Das Deutsche Fremdwörterbuch by Hans Schulz, the first volume of which appeared as early as 1913 and which has long needed revision, acquired in 1942 a second volume done by Otto Basler. Unfortunately the third volume is still not forthcoming. Indeed, nowadays one would view the whole question of a dictionary of foreign words in quite a different way (cf. von Polenz 1967), which raises very difficult, fundamental questions.

Trübner's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* was begun in 1939 and completed in 1957; see Goetze and Mitzka, eds. (1939–57). The intended purpose is to give the most important evidence for selected word-history in eight volumes; however, it varies a great deal in quality and in the first volumes is very much influenced by the spirit of the period of its origin.

A dictionary of the contemporary German language began to appear in 1961 (see Klappenbach and Steinitz 1964), the only larger undertaking of its kind since the war to include the German language in both parts of the country. Its task is to present the German vocabulary items of today with their usages. 'The following major goals are connected with this task: a statement of the meaning of the individual word, its stylistic characteristics, its grammatical characteristics and its use in the sentence. As a scientific dictionary it includes the word not only in many pattern-sentences and structures, but also in quotations with the exact volume and page-reference in order to enable the teacher and scholar to look them up' (Foreword p. 3). The articles are systematically constructed and arranged according to meanings. Grammatical points are taken into consideration but, because of the arrangement, they fall into the background. There has been an attempt to keep the statements of meaning concise and simple in formulation. In explaining the word semantically, synonyms are used rather seldom; circumscriptive interpretations or definitions are often used. The dictionary views the stylistic characterization of German vocabulary as a major concern; therefore the words and their application in various usages are given an evaluation and are assigned to a certain level of style. Only very provisional associations can be looked for here, since the problem of determining what is typical for levels of style in German has not yet been overcome.

A dictionary of colloquial German by Heinz Küpper, previously published in five volumes, includes primarily the vulgar language and is extremely vulnerable as concerns its method of classifying as well as its content (Küpper 1963–67). A one-volume edition with the title *Handliches Wörterbuch der deutschen Alltagssprache* (1968) is even more diffuse because it is not merely an excerpting of the five-volume collection; new material has been incorporated to some extent.

The *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache* by Erich Mater (1965) is extremely useful. He began to publish a complete collection of German

verbs, a few volumes of which are now available (1966ff.).

In addition, after the war a series of specialized dictionaries and word-indexes appeared, in the production of which computers had been used to some extent (cf. Garvin 1963, de Tollenaere 1965, Bahr 1966). The *Goethe-Wörterbuch*, volume 1, 1966 (cf. also Stickel and Gräfe 1966) is to be especially recommended, as are the *Indices zur deutschen Literatur*, which appeared in 1968 beginning with Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* (Schwerte and Schanze 1968).

At the *Institut für deutsche Sprache* in Mannheim ca. thirty studies (*belles lettres*, popular scientific literature, reference books, and single publication years of newspapers and periodicals) from the period since 1945, containing about 1.5 million words, have been punched out and copied onto magnetic tape. From among them, some wordlists and frequency tables have already been printed out. This material will be available to lexicographers of the most modern German. In addition, it serves as a foundation for grammatical studies in the contemporary language. In the research department of the *Institut für deutsche Sprache* in Freiburg, approximately the same amount of texts of spoken standard German has accumulated, so that very inclusive wordlists and frequency tables of the contemporary written and spoken standard language will be available in the foreseeable future (cf. also von Polenz 1966, Steger 1969a).

Fundamental problems are becoming apparent for lexicography in the wake of the continuing development of the description of language. Our methods of producing dictionaries, inherited from the nineteenth century, combine the syntactic, morphological, semantic, and lexical areas — and the content/expression levels as well — and, in general, are arranged alphabetically. These methods will have to undergo a radical redefinition if lexicography is to take its place in a methodologically strict description of language. Almost nothing has been worked out in Germany for this purpose.

On lexicography of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries we now have the fine summarizing study by Henne (1968). Scholarly interests have once again turned altogether toward lexicology of the early stages of the standard German language, and a series of dictionaries of the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries have been and are being reprinted. For particulars, cf.: on the dictionaries by M. Kramer and K. Stieler, G. Ising (1956); on Frisch, Powitz (1959); Kurrelmeyer (1948); Schirokauer (1945.)

Among the practical dictionaries, various ones which have appeared in the *Grosser Duden* series are especially to be recommended.

2.2 *Language History*

The descriptions of historical grammar, especially of the older period up to Middle High German, through the Neo-Grammarians up to the present period (the close of the 1960s), have continually gone through new editions. They have remained — as already indicated under 1.1 and 2.1 — unchanged in their total framework, despite all

the revisions. Beyond these, new texts have appeared since 1945, once again, especially of the older period. These texts retain the pattern and the methods of the preceding grammars, possibly orienting even more to the historical, so that transition-forms between historical grammars and language history in the Neo-Grammarian sense are produced.

In contrast to this, none of the actual historical descriptions of the Neo-Grammarians, which had undergone several editions before and after the First World War, and which controlled the field during this period, has a very broad influence today.

Neither Hermann Hirt's nor Otto Behaghel's *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* has been revised or reissued since 1925 and 1928 respectively, and they no longer play a role in the consciousness of the student generation of today. Friedrich Kluge's *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte* (1925a) has likewise disappeared.

Appearing in their place are the historical treatments by A. Bach (1965), Sperber and von Polenz (1966), Moser (1969), Tschirch (1966–68). A. Langen (in Stammler 1957) covers the period from the Baroque up to the present, delving particularly into the literary language. Mackensen (1956) takes up some characteristics of language history of the twentieth century. The *Wortgeschichte* by Maurer and Stroh (1959), too, treats the more modern period very thoroughly. Particularly rich in material is Moser's contribution on the contemporary language; indeed, Moser has furnished a rather large number of rich contributions on this topic. Schwarz' *Wortgeschichte* (1967) also includes word problems of the more recent period. Among the monographs on specific historical topics, Langen's treatment of the period of Pietism (1954), as well as Blackall's *Emergence of German as a literary language* 1700–1775 (1959; German 1966), deserve high recommendation.

As the comparison with historical grammars has already indicated, this separation of the older series of language histories has nothing to do with the fact that a new generation of Germanists wrote its own textbooks. Rather, this phenomenon could well show that historical grammar has long been methodologically stagnant and has ceased to be interesting, while language history has continued to grow. Most likely of all is that a changed conception of language history itself is shown in this separation.

We find predominating in Behaghel a historical theory of phonology and morphology as internal linguistic 'history' without deeper connections to external linguistic relationships and stimuli. We see a strong emphasis on the older period with its phonological and formal changes, although Behaghel has already included dialects and questions of loanwords in a progressive way — to be sure, without working with language geography. A standard work of the twenties and thirties was thus produced through the abundance of the material included, the extremely inclusive elaboration of independent literature, and by numerous stimuli which originated with him.

In Hirt, particular emphasis is placed on etymology, while Kluge places the history of vocabulary in the foreground. Thus he brings liveliness into his explanations and necessarily pushes on to connections with cultural history and other general connections.

These main points show that not until the thirties was the time ripe for the writing of a balanced language history which would take the various areas of language properly into consideration. In this connection it must be remembered that the foundations of historical grammar in its present form were developed only at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries by the Neo-Grammarians, which was not without repercussions on their linguistic studies.

To be sure, there is also a more limited view which originated in the basically positivistic approach of the period. This becomes immediately clear in a comparison of the more influential attitudes for generally determining what language history is. Friedrich Maurer summarizes the Neo-Grammarian conception of it before going into the new development of language history: 'Historical grammar differs from a language history in that it observes individual events for their own sake, the sounds, the forms, the vocabulary, sentence structure; while language history, by surveying the large movements, seeks to recognize and establish the entire development. For this, however, a historical grammar as a basis and substructure is quite necessary, as conversely, the grammar is possible only within the framework of historical knowledge' (Maurer 1934:201).

These sentences can, in the final analysis, be directly compared to the following statement by Peter von Polenz, but in looking deeper we perceive a clear difference: 'Not every diachronic study of language is language history. The description of historical linguistic states and processes is, in the first place, the task of historical grammar and historical philology. Writers of language history choose, from among the conclusions of this branch of research, those events of linguistic change which are essential for the development of a language, and also seek their possible external causes, be that in the realm of the political, social, economic, religious, or in the history of ideas; be it in the quest for the relationship between speech and writing, between speech community and speech area, or in the influence of foreign languages. Thus, language history inquires into the historical position of the language in the entire culture, of every speech community' (Sperber and von Polenz 1966:5).

Merely from the exhaustive and differentiated enumeration of the external restrictions of linguistic history does it become clear where the accents of the new conception of language history, which have been developing since the thirties, now lie.

In fact, closer examination of the tendencies in the writing of German language history shows that a twofold development of the Neo-Grammarian fundamentals has come about since the twenties.

One branch of research 'tries to get closer to the origin and development of certain linguistic phenomena, and explores the variety in their distribution and the respective changes in their areas of distribution' (Maurer 1934:202). Entirely new fields of material and methods of working in the writing of language history are appearing along with this trend in research: in addition to the literary language, which at first was almost the sole determining factor, and to the one-dimensional evaluation of dialect, the social, regional social, and other dialects in their geographic distribution are more

and more being used as raw material. Geographic treatment of language is emerging as a new method together with the wish to study linguistic movements and speech areas. Linguistic maps, chiefly the phonology, morphology, and word-maps, are becoming one of the most important research tools in language history. An important model for them is the *Deutsche Sprachatlas* (*DSA* 1926); later the *Deutsche Wortatlas* (*DWA* 1951), in addition to which regional atlases are gradually appearing.

This direction in research is proving to be fruitful also because it is leading to cooperation of research language history with other disciplines; with history in all its subdivisions, with the geography of settling, and with sociology, so that extralinguistic causes of language change are being brought into sharper focus. Especially the names Frings, Maurer, Mitzka, Schwarz, Stroh, Teuchert, Wagner, and Wrede, among others, are connected with this direction in scholarship. They belong to the history of New High German language-history writing insofar as their material covers, first of all, the living dialects. Through their intention of illuminating older stages of the language with this modern material, they are, however, to some extent effective for the linguistic history of Middle High German (cf. 1.2.5). Insofar as they are also interested in sociolinguistics, as for example Maurer and Stroh (also Hugo Moser, Ludwig-Erich Schmitt, Rudolf Grosse, Günther Bellman, and in general the whole group of the younger Leipzig Germanists), they are contributing immediately to the language history of New High German. For the literature cf. A. Bach (1950), E. Schwarz (1950), Mitzka (1943), Maurer (1964a), and also in the above-mentioned language histories.

A second direction in language-history research which originated in the twenties through various external stimuli can be paraphrased as follows: 'Language history is the history of ideas, it is cultural history.' At first, traditional scholarship was opposed to it, to some degree justifiably so, because some of its basic tenets are questionable.

But, especially through closer contact with the older scholarship and in connection with the other new trend in language-history writing just outlined, a good part of the future is committed to the idea that language history must enter into a close alliance with cultural history and the history of ideas. Only since the two new tendencies have made themselves felt has language history, with its many problems in the area of language levels and social dialects, technical language and the development of independent languages, arrived at more balanced conclusions. The history of style has likewise received too little attention.

The new theory of language history is, therefore, in part connected with the idea of studying language as a totality, as it was described under 2.1.2, and also has periods in which it was too much influenced by irrational (and national-ideological tendencies. Furthermore, the limitations of language and cultural criticism have, even today, not yet been sharply enough delineated (von Polenz 1968:159ff.).

The fact that this was and is possible is also a sign that rational descriptive methods of language history still need improvement. Above all, the application of empirical methods and the formulation of theories in the sociolinguistic and socio-psycho-

logical area seem urgently needed, and for this there have been only a few beginnings up to this time. (Cf. Freudenberg 1968:170; Hünert-Hofmann 1968:3; Steger 1964a and b, 1967b; Steger to appear soon).

On the other hand, the writing of language history is still very much affected by the disadvantages of the atomistic descriptive methods of historical grammar (cf. under 2.1.0) when isolated problems of sound, form, word, or syntax, and also spatial classification of individual sounds and words, are being historically interpreted.

For a future language history, including that of more modern German, the perceptions of modern structural linguistics still remain to be incorporated. Language history regards this as something that will follow from the conditions of a cooperative system. Everyone who has had experience in this field knows that, at present, almost insurmountable difficulties oppose such an intent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This article was written in 1968. Additional bibliographical references were added in 1969. Sinde then there was a veritable explosion of linguistic publications in Germany. It therefore no longer reflects the state of research.

ABRAHAM, W. 1968. Subklassifizierung von deutschen Verben. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik. Papier 8.

ADELBERG, E. 1960. Die Sätze des Typus 'Ih bin ez Joseph' im Mittelhochdeutschen. Berlin.

ADMONI, W. 1934. Über die Wortstellung im Deutschen. Zwei Welten. Monatsschrift für Politik und Literatur. Moscow. (= Moser 1964, Abstract.)

——. 1960. Der deutsche Sprachbau. Leningrad.

AHLSSON, L.-E. 1965. Zur Substantivflexion im Thüringischen des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Stud. Germ. Ups., 3.) Uppsala.

ALANNE, E. 1950. Die deutsche Weinbauterminologie in althochdeutscher und mittelhochdeutscher Zeit. AASF 65/1. Helsinki.

——. 1957. Das Fortleben der mittelhochdeutschen Ausdrücke für den Weinberg, Weinbergarbeiten und Weinsorten am Oberrhein. (Mémoirés de la Société Neophilologique Helsinki 20/2). Helsinki.

——. 1963. Die Stellung der Weinbauterminologie in den westgerm. Hauptdialekten mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des deutschen Sprachgebietes. NphM 64.16–40.

ALDENHOFF, J. 1961. Doppelformen im Verbalsystem der heutigen deutschen Schrift- und Umgangssprache. RLaV 27.501–43.

ALLWEYER, M. 1951. Der Begriff von *leit* und *liden*, bei Meister Eckhart und Heinrich Seuse. Diss. Freiburg. (Masch.).

AMMANN, H. 1925–28. Die menschliche Rede. 2 vols. Lahr.

ANTONSEN, E. H. 1961. Germanic Umlaut anew. Lg 37. 215–30.

——. 1964. Zum Umlaut im Deutschen. PBB(T) 86.177–96.

——. 1966. Suprasegmentals in German. Lg 42.587–601.

ARENS, H. 1955. Sprachwissenschaft. Der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart. Freiburg/Br. and Munich.

ARNTZ, H. 1934. Deutsche Grammatik. Germanische Philologie. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel, 75–109. Heidelberg.

ASHER, J.A. 1961. Problems in the description of Middle High German. Te Reo 4.25-9.

——. 1967 (1968). A short descriptive grammar of Middle High German with texts and vocabulary. London.

BACH, A. 1950. Deutsche Mundartforschung. Ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. (Germanische Bibliothek, 3. Reihe). 2nd ed. Heidelberg.

——. 1952–56. Deutsche Namenkunde. 3 vols., 2nd ed. Heidelberg.

——. 1965. Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. 8th ed. Heidelberg.

BACH, E. 1962. The order of elements in a transformational grammar of German. Lg 38.263–9.

BACH, H. 1955. Die Entstehung der deutschen Hochsprache im Frühneuhochdeutschen. ZMaF 23.193–201.

BACHOFER, W. 1963. Zur Wandlung des *Minne*-Begriffs bei Walther. Festschrift für Ulrich Pretzel, 139–49. Berlin.

BAEUML, F.H. 1960. Rhetorical devices and structure in the Ackermann aus Böhmen. Berkeley.

BAHNER, W. 1962. Grundzüge der Feldtheorie von Jost Trier. Eine kritische Analyse. WZUL X/11.393–598.

BAHR, J. 1966. Technische Verfahren in der Lexikographie. ZDS 22.96–111.

BASLER, O. 1935. Der Große Duden, Vol. 3: Grammatik. Leipzig.

BAUMGÄRTNER, K. 1967. Die Struktur des Bedeutungsfeldes. Sprache der Gegenwart, Satz und Wort im heutigen Deutsch, Vol. I. 165–97. Düsseldorf.

——. 1968. Synästhesie und das Problem der sprachlichen Universalien. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik. Papier 5. Stuttgart.

——. 1969a. Forschungsbericht 'Syntax und Semantik'. Probleme des Deutschen als Fremdsprache. Munich.

——. 1969b. Konstituenz und Dependenz. Zur Integration der beiden grammatischen Prinzipien, 52–77 (= Steger 1970).

——, KÜHNAST, J., and D. WUNDERLICH. 1967. Entwurf einer Semantik des deutschen Tempussystems. Berlin. (Offset manuscript.)

BAYER, H.J. 1962. Untersuchungen zum Sprachstil weltlicher Epen des deutschen Früh- und Hochmittelalters. Berlin.

BEBERMEYER, G. 1929. Das Wesen der frühneuhochdeutschen Sprache (1350–1600). ZFDK 43.697–707.

BECH, G. 1949. Das semantische System der deutschen Modalverba. TCLC 4.3–46.

——. 1951. Grundzüge der semantischen Entwicklungsgeschichte der hochdeutschen Modalverba. HFM 32. Copenhagen.

——. 1955. Studien über das deutsche verbum infinitum, I. HFM 35. Copenhagen.

——. 1963a. Über den Gebrauch des Präsens Konj. im Deutschen. Lingua 12.39–53.

——. 1963b. Zur Morphologie der deutschen Substantive. Lingua 12.177–89.

BECHERT, J. 1968. Zur Konstituentenstruktur von Nominalsätzen. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik, Papier 8.

BECKER, H. 1953. Zur monophonematischen Wertung. ZPhon 7. 253–8.

BECKER, K. F. 1827. Organismen der Sprache. Als Einleitung zur deutschen Grammatik. 3 vols. 2nd ed. 1841. Frankfurt/Main.

——. 1831. Schulgrammatik der deutschen Sprache. 8th rev. ed. 1863. Frankfurt/Main.

——. 1836–39. Ausführliche deutsche Grammatik als Kommentar der Schulgrammatik. Statt einer zweiten Auflage der deutschen Grammatik. 3 vols. Frankfurt/Main.

——. 1830, 1855. A grammar of the German language. London. (English edition of Becker 1831).

BEHAGHEL, O. 1923–32. Deutsche Syntax. 4 vols. Heidelberg.

——. 1930. Die deutsche Sprache. 8th ed. Leipzig.

BESCH, W. 1961. Schriftzeichen und Laut. Möglichkeiten der Lautwertbestimmung an deutschen Handschriften des späten Mittelalters. ZDPh 80.287–302.

——. 1964. Zweigliedriger Ausdruck in der deutschen Prosa des 15. Jahrhunderts. NPhM 65.200–21.

——. 1967. Sprachlandschaften und Sprachausgleich im 15. Jahrhundert. Studien zur Erforschung der spätmittelhochdeutschen Schreibdialekte und zur Entstehung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. (Bibliotheca Germanica 11.) Munich.

——. 1968. Die Entstehung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. ZDPh 87.1–57.

BETZ, W. 1953. Zur Überprüfung des Feldbegriffes. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 70.

BIENER, CL. 1922a. Wie ist die neuhochdeutsche Regel über die Stellung des Verbums entstanden? ZDA 59.165–79.

——. 1922b. Zur Methode der Untersuchung über deutsche Wortstellung. ZDA 59.127–44.

——. 1926. Die Stellung des Verbs im Deutschen. ZDA 63.225–56.

BIERWISCH, M. 1961. Ein Modell für die syntaktische Struktur deutscher Nominalgruppen. ZPhon 14.244–78.

——. 1962. Grammatik des deutschen Verbs. (3rd ed. 1966 = Studia Grammatica 2.) Berlin.

——. 1965. Eine Hierarchie syntaktisch-semantischer Merkmale. (3rd ed. 1970. Studia Grammatica 5. 29–86.) Berlin.

——. 1966a. Strukturalismus. Geschichte, Probleme und Methoden. Kursbuch 5, ed. by H. M. Enzensberger, 77–152. Frankfurt/M.

——. 1966b. Aufgaben und Form der Grammatik, Zeichen und System der Sprache. Berlin. (= Steger 1970)

——. 1967a. Some universals of German adjectivals. (= Steger 1970)

——. 1967b. Syntactic feature in morphology: General problems of so-called pro-

nominal inflection in German. To honor Roman Jakobson. The Hague.
——, and K. HEIDOLPH. 1970. Progress in linguistics. The Hague, Mouton.
——, and W. U. WURZEL. 1969. Studien zur deutschen Lautstruktur. (Studia Grammatica 8.) Berlin.
BINDEWALD, H. 1928. Die Sprache der Reichskanzlei zur Zeit König Wenzels. Halle.
BIRNBAUM, S. A. 1961. Old Yiddish or Middle High German? JJewS 12.19–31.
BISCHOFF, K. 1966. Mittelalterliche Überlieferung und Sprach- und Siedlungsgeschichte im Ostniederdeutschen. Wiesbaden.
——. 1967. Sprache und Geschichte an der mittleren Elbe und der unteren Saale. Cologne and Graz.
BITHELL, J. 1952. German pronunciation and phonology. London.
BLACKALL, E. A. 1959. The emergence of German as a literary language 1700–1775. Cambridge, University Press. (German ed. = Schürmann, H. G. 1966. Die Entwicklung des Deutschen zur Literatursprache 1700–1775. Stuttgart. Latest bibliography and research 1955–1964 indicated by D. Krinpel.)
BLOOMFIELD, L. 1930. German *ç* and *x*. MPhon 3/8.
——. 1938. Initial [k] in German. Lg 14.178–86.
BOESCH, B. 1946. Untersuchungen zur alemannischen Urkundensprache des 13. Jahrhunderts. Laut und Formenlehre. Bern.
——. 1968. Die deutsche Urkundensprache. Probleme ihrer Erforschung im deutschen Südwesten. RhVJ 32.1–28.
BONNIN, G. M. 1960. A phonetic system for Middle High German. University of Queensland, Fac. of Arts. I/3.1–20.
BOOR, H. DE, and D. HAACKE. 1957. Corpus der altdeutschen Originalurkunden bis zum Jahr 1300. Vol. 3., Vorrede. Lahr/Baden.
BOOR, H. DE, and R. WISNIEWSKI. 1967. Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. 5th ed. (Sammlung Göschen, 1108.) Berlin.
BOOST, K. 1955. Neue Untersuchungen zum Wesen und zur Struktur des deutschen Satzes. Der Satz als Spannungsfeld. Berlin.
BRINKMANN, H. 1951. Die Wortarten im Deutschen. WW 1.65–79.
——. 1953. Der Umkreis des persönlichen Lebens im deutschen Dativ. Mu 104–11.
——. 1959. Die 'haben' Perspektive im Deutschen. Festschrift für Leo Weisgerber, 176–94. Düsseldorf.
——. 1962. Die deutsche Sprache. Gestalt und Leistung. Düsseldorf.
——. 1964. Das deutsche Adjektiv in synchroner und diachronischer Sicht. WW 14.94–104.
BROOKE, K. 1955. An introduction to early New High German. Oxford.
BRÜCKNER, M. 1955. Geschichte des Wortes 'innerlich' und verwandter Bildungen und Ausdrucksformen im Mittelhochdeutschen. Diss. Mainz.
BÜHLER, K. 1934. Sprachtheorie. (2nd ed. 1965.) Stuttgart.
BULACH, N. A. 1960. Razvitie mononegativnosti v sisteme otricanija v ranenovoveschnenemeckom periode. (Die Entwicklung der einfachen Negation im Nega-

tionssystem der frühneuhochdeutschen Periode.) Voprosy teorii nemeckogo jazyka. Vol. 1. Irkutsk.

BUMKE, J. 1964. Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert. (Beihefte zum Euphorion 1.) Heidelberg.

BURDACH, K. 1926. Jahresbericht über die Forschungen zur neuhochdeutschen Sprach- und Bildungsgeschichte. (Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 58–9.74f.) Berlin.

——. 1932, 1934, 1935. Forschungen zur neuhochdeutschen Sprach- und Bildungsgeschichte. (Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1.78f., 2.68–71, 3.81–4.) Berlin.

CLÉMENT, D. 1968. Der attributive Genitiv im Deutschen. Universität Stuttgart. Lehrstuhl für Linguistik. Papier 8.

CLIFFORD, B. 1965. Die Leistungen der amerikanischen neueren Germanistik während des letzten Jahrzehnts (1951–61). WW 15.343–50.

CORDES, G. 1959. Zur Erforschung der Urkundensprache. NJb 82.63–79.

CURME, G.O. 1922. A grammar of the German language designed for a thoro and practical study of the language as spoken and written to-day. 2nd ed. New York.

DAL, I. 1952. Kurze deutsche Syntax. Tübingen.

——. 1960. Zur Frage des süddeutschen Präteritumschwundes. Indogermanica. Festschrift für W. Krause, 1–7. Heidelberg.

DALBY, D. 1961. Der *mære wildenære*. Euphorion 55.77–84.

——. 1965. Lexicon of the medieval German hunt. A lexicon of Middle High German terms (1050–1500), associated with the chase, hunting with bows, falconry, trapping and fowling. Berlin.

DAM, J. VAN. 1937–40. Handbuch der deutschen Sprache. 2 vols. (Vol. 1, 3rd. ed. 1958; vol. 2, 2nd ed. 1951.) Groningen.

DEBRUNNER, A. 1951. Von den modalen Hilfsverben im Deutschen. Sprachspiegel 7.1–24.

DEBUS, F.L. 1966. Aspekte zum Verhältnis Name — Wort. Groningen.

DIETRICH, G. 1953. [ç] und [x] im Deutschen — ein Phonem oder zwei. ZPhon 7. 28–37.

DITTRICH, M.-L. 1960. Gote und got in Heinrichs van Veldeke Eneide. ZDA 90.85–122, 188–240, 274–302.

DORNSEIFF, F. 1944. List und Kunst. DVLG 22.231–6.

——. 1964. Sprache und Sprechender (mit kritischer Literatur zur Feldtheorie). Ed. by J. Werner. Leipzig.

DRACH, E. 1940. Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre. 2nd ed. Frankfurt/M. (3rd ed. Darmstadt 1963.)

DRESEL, J. 1966. Zum Funktionsfeld der temporalen Präpositionen im frühen Ostmitteldeutschen 1200–1550. Diss. Leipzig.

DSA. 1926. Deutscher Sprachatlas, ed. by F. Wrede, contin. by W. Mitzka and B. Martin. Marburg/Lahn.

'*Duden*'. 1966. Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. (= Der große Duden. Bd. 4.) Ed. von der Dudenredaktion unter Leitung von P. Grebe. 2nd ed. Mannheim.

DÜRING, E. 1944. Zwîvel. Ein Versuch zur Klärung der negativen Begriffe der höfischen Wertelehre. Diss. Freiburg.

DWA. 1951–. Deutscher Wortatlas, ed. by W. Mitzka und L.E. Schmitt. Gießen.

EGGERS, H. 1961. Wandlung im deutschen Satzbau. DU 13.47–61.

——. 1965. Deutsche Sprachgeschichte II: Das Mittelhochdeutsche. Reinbek.

EICHLER, E. 1962. Veröffentlichungen der Leipziger namenkundlichen Arbeitsgruppe. (Leipziger Abhandlungen zur Namenforschung und Siedlungsgeschichte.) Leipzig.

——. 1963. Bibliographie der Namenforschung in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. Leipzig.

EIS, G. 1950. Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Mittelhochdeutschen. Heidelberg.

——. 1958. Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Mittelhochdeutschen. Halle.

——. 1966. Mittelalterliche Fachprosa der Artes. Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, ed. by W. Stammler, 2. 1103–1216. 2nd ed. Berlin.

——. 1967. Mittelalterliche Fachliteratur. (Sammlung Metzler.) 2nd ed. Stuttgart.

Festschrift Eis. 1968. Fachliteratur des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Gerhard Eis, ed. by G. Keil et al. Stuttgart.

ENDRES, R. 1961. Studien zum Stil von Hartmanns Erec. Diss. Munich.

ENGEL, U. 1967. Satzbaupläne in der Alltagssprache. Satz und Wort im heutigen Deutsch. Sprache 55–73. Düsseldorf.

——. 1969. Zur Beschreibung der Struktur deutscher Sätze. Neue Beiträge zur deutschen Grammatik, H. Moser zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet. (= Duden-Beiträge 37.) Mannheim, Vienna, Zurich.

ERBEN, J. 1950. Syntaktische Untersuchungen zu einer Grundlegung der Geschichte der indefiniten Pronomina im Deutschen. PBB 72.193–221.

——. 1955. Prinzipielles zur Syntaxforschung, mit dem besonderen Blick auf Grundfragen der deutschen Syntax. PBB(H) 76.144–65. (= Ringen um eine neue deutsche Grammatik, ed. by H. Moser, 505–26.) Darmstadt, 1965.

——. 1958. Abriß der deutschen Grammatik. (8th ed. 1967.) Berlin.

——. 1959. Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kollektiva. Festschrift für Leo Weisgerber, 221–8. Düsseldorf.

——. 1961. Bemerkungen zu einigen Grundfragen wissenschaftlicher Sprachbeschreibung. (H. Brinkmann zur Vollendung des 60. Lebenjahres.) WW 3. 144–9.

——. 1962. Ausklang des Mittelhochdeutschen. Spätzeiten und Spätzeitlichkeit. Vorträge, gehalten auf dem II. Internationalen Germanistenkongress 1960 in Kopenhagen, ed. by W. Kohlschmidt, 86–102. Bern and Munich.

——. 1964a. Deutsche Wortbildung in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht. WW 14.

——. 1964b. Zum Neubau der deutschen Grammatik. DU 16.53–66.

——. 1968. Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Leitfaden. Frankfurt/M.

FAHRNER, R. 1929. Wortsinn und Wortschöpfung bei Meister Eckehart. Marburg/Lahn.

FECHTER, W. 1963. Ostern als Metapher in mittelhochdeutschen Dichtungen. PBB(T) 85.289–96.

FICKEL, M.E. 1948. Die Bedeutung von 'sēle', 'līp' and 'herze' in der frühmittelhochdeutschen Dichtung und in den Texten der mittelhochdeutschen Klassik. Phil. Diss. Tubingen (Masch.).

FILIČÉVA, N.J. 1959. Istorija nemeckogo jazyka. Kurs lekcij. Moscow.

FINCK, F.N. 1899. Der deutsche Sprachbau als Ausdruck deutscher Weltanschauung. Marburg/Lahn.

FISCHER, F. 1955. Der Formenbestand des Adjektivs in der mittelhochdeutschen Lyrik der Blütezeit. Bremgarten.

FLÄMIG, W. 1959. Zum Konjunktiv in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. 2nd ed. Berlin.

——. 1964. Untersuchungen zum Finalsatz im Deutschen. (Synchronie und Diachronie.) SbDAW 64/5. Berlin.

FLEISCHER, W. 1965a. Untersuchungen zur Geschäftssprache des 16. Jahrhunderts in Dresden. Ein Beitrag zur neuhochdeutschen Norm und zur strukturellen Darstellung frühmittelhochdeutscher Texte. Habil.-Schrift. Leipzig. (Masch.)

——. 1965b. Zum Verhältnis von Phonem und Graphem bei der Herausbildung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. WZUJ 14.461–5.

——. 1965c. Entwicklungstendenzen der nominalen Wortbildung. Deutsch als Fremdsprache 2/3–4.

——. 1966. Strukturelle Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Neuhochdeutschen. SbSAW 112.6. Berlin.

——. 1967. Grundzüge der Wortbildung des Verbs in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. Deutsch als Fremdsprache 4/1.

FODOR, J.A., and J.J. KATZ, eds. 1964. The structure of language: Readings in the philosophy of language. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

FOERSTEMANN, E. 1856–72. Altdeutsches Namenbuch. Vol. 1: Personennamen. Vol. 2: Ortsnamen. Nordhausen.

FOLSOM, M.H. 1961. The syntax of substantive and non-finite satellites to the finite verb in German. Cornell University. Diss. (= Janua linguarum, Series practica 30. The Hague and Paris, 1966.)

FORSCHHAMMER, J. 1953. Zum Affrikaten-Problem. ZPhon 7. 403–8.

FOURQUET, J. 1938. L'ordre des éléments de la phrase en germanique ancien. Strasbourg. (= Moser 1965, Abstract.)

——. 1952. The two e's of Middle High German. A diachronic phonemic approach. Word 8.122–35.

——. 1965. L'analyse structurale de la phrase allemande. LC 1.49–60. (= Steger 1970.)

——. 1965. Grammaire de l'allemand. Paris.

——. 1967. Umbau der Lehrbücher der historischen Lautlehre im Sinne der Phonologie. Phonologie der Gegenwart, ed. by J. Hamm et al. (WSlJb, Erg. Bd. 6.) Graz.

——. 1970. Prolegomena zu einer deutschen Grammatik. Sprache der Gegenwart, Vol. 7. Düsseldorf.

FRANK, G. 1949. Studien zur Bedeutungsgeschichte von 'Sünde' und sinnverwandten Wörtern in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Freiburg.

FRÄNZEL, E.M. 1947. Die Metaphor 'der Mensch — ein Gefäß' im mittelalterlichen Sprachgebrauch des deutschen Volkes. Diss. Vienna. (Masch.)

FRENCH, H. 1952. The secondary verb in Middle High German and New High German. Indiana University. Diss.

FREUDENBERG, R. 1968. Alemannisch. Wortgeographie und Gesellschaft, ed. by W. Mitzka, 170–84. Berlin.

FREYER, H. 1927. Sprache und Kultur. Die Erziehung 3.65–78. Leipzig.

FRINGS, TH. 1948. Grundlegung einer Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. Halle.

——. 1956. Sprache und Geschichte. 3 vols. (Mitteldeutsche Studien, 16–18.) Halle/Saale.

FUNKE, O. 1924. Innere Sprachform. Reichenberg.

FURSTNER, H. 1956. Studien zur Wesensbestimmung der höfischen Minne. Groningen.

GÁRDONYI, S. 1965. Die Kanzleisprache von Schemnitz und Kremnitz im 14. bis 16. Jahrhundert. Német Filológiai Tanulmányok 1.29–78.

——. 1966. Das Stadtbuch von Schmöllnitz. Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Kanzleisprache in der Slowakei. Német Filológiai Tanulmányok 2.109–38.

GARVIN, P.L., ed. 1963. Natural language and the computer. University of California Engineering and Science Extension Series. New York.

GELHAUS, H. 1966. Zum Tempussystem der deutschen Hochsprache. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag. WW 16.217–30.

GEPPERT, W.I. 1969. Die mystische Sprache des St. Trudperter Hohen Liedes. Berlin.

GERHARDT, D. 1950. Zum Lautsystem des Neuhochdeutschen. ZPhon 4.132–7.

——. 1952. Noch einmal die schriftdeutschen Affrikaten. ZPhon 6. 57–76.

GERNENTZ, H.J. 1960. Formen und Funktionen der direkten Reden und der Redeszenen in der epischen Dichtung von 1150–1200. Habil.-Schr. Rostock.

GIESE, J. 1951. Untersuchungen zur *Minne*auffassung Wolframs von Eschenbach. Diss. Tübingen. (Masch.)

GIPPER, H., ed. 1959a. Sprache — Schlüssel zur Welt. Festschrift für Leo Weisgerber. Düsseldorf.

——. 1959b. Sessel oder Stuhl? Ein Beitrag zur Bestimmung von Wortinhalten im

Bereich der Sachkultur. Sprache Schlüssel zur Welt. Festschrift für Leo Weisgerber, 271–92. Düsseldorf.

——. 1963. Bausteine zur Sprachinhaltsforschung. (Sprache und Gemeinschaft, Studien, vol. 1, ed. by L. Weisgerber.) Düsseldorf.

GIPPER, H., and H. SCHWARZ. 1962. Bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachinhaltsforschung. Vol. 1. Köln-Opladen.

GLINZ, H. 1947. Geschichte und Kritik der Lehre von den Satzgliedern in der deutschen Grammatik. Bern.

——. 1962. Worttheorie auf strukturalistischer und inhaltsbezogener Grundlage. PICL 9. 1051–62.

——. 1965a. Deutsche Syntax. Sammlung Metzler 43. 3rd ed. 1970. Stuttgart.

——. 1965b. Grundbegriffe und Methoden inhaltsbezogener Text- und Sprachanalyse. Sprache und Gemeinschaft, Grundlegung, vol. 3. Düsseldorf.

——. 1966. Ansätze zu einer Sprachtheorie. 2nd ed. Düsseldorf.

——. 1967. Deutsche Syntax. 2nd ed. Sammlung Metzler 43. Stuttgart.

——. 1968. Die innere Form des Deutschen. 5th ed. (1st ed. 1952.) Bern.

GÖTZ, H. 1957. Leitwörter des Minnesangs. SbSAW 49.117–422.

GÖTZE, A. 1956. Frühneuhochdeutsches Glossar. 5th ed. Berlin.

——, and W. MITZKA. 1939–57. Trübners deutsches Wörterbuch, Bd. 1–8. Berlin.

GRÄFF, M.L. 1946. Studien zum Kunst- und Stilwandel des 13. Jahrhunderts: Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan und Isolde; Rudolf von Ems, Willehalm; Konrad von Würzburg, Engelhard; Einfrid von Braunschweig. Diss. Tübingen. (Masch.)

GREBE, P. 1966. Der semantisch-syntaktische Hof unserer Wörter. WW 16.391–4.

GREEN, D.H. 1949. Konrads Trojanerkrieg und Gottfrieds Tristan. Vorstudien zum gotischen Stil in der Dichtung. Diss. Basel.

GRIMM, J. and W. 1854–1960. Deutsches Wörterbuch 16 (= 32) vols., ed. by Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.

GROßE, R. 1960. Strukturalismus und Dialektgeographie. Biuletyn Fonograficny 3.

——, and H. PROTZE. 1956. Neueste Forschung. Festgabe für Theodor Frings zum 70. Geburtstag, 173ff. Berlin.

GROSSE, S. 1964. Methoden inhaltsbezogener Sprachforschung. WW 14.73–83.

GRUENTER, R. 1955. Der paradisus der Wiener Genesis. Euphorion 49.121–44.

——. 1957. Bauformen der Waldleben-Episode in Gottfrieds Tristan und Isold. Gestaltung, Umgestaltung. Festschrift zum 75. Geburtstag von Hermann August Korff, 21–48. Leipzig.

——. 1961. Das guldine lougen. Zu Gottfrieds Tristan, vv. 17536–17556. Euphorion 55.1–14.

——. 1962. Zum Problem der Landschaftsdarstellung im höfischen Versroman. Euphorion 56.248–78.

GUCHMAN, M.M. 1955–59. Ot jazyka nemeckoj naroduosti k nemeckomu nacional' nomu jazyku. 2 vols. Moscow.

——. 1961. Über die verbalen analytischen Formen im modernen Deutsch. PBB(H), Sonderband für E. Karg-Gasterstädt, 415–27. Halle/Saale.

——. 1964. Der Weg zur deutschen Nationalsprache. (Bausteine zur Sprachgeschichte des Neuhochdeutschen.) 2 vols. tr. into German and ed. by G. Feudel: vol. 1, 1964; vol. 2, 1969. Berlin. (= German translation of 1955–59.)

HAACKE, D. 1964. Schreiberprobleme, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Nürnberger deutschen Urkunden des 13. Jahrhunderts. PBB(T) 86.107–41.

HAGSTRÖM, S. 1952. Zur Inversion in deutschen Sachwörtern. UUÅ 8.

HAHN, A. 1949. Bildhafte Elemente im deutschen Minnesang. Diss. Bonn (Masch.).

HALLE, M. 1953. The German conjugation. Word 9.45–53.

HAMMERSCHMIDT, G. 1948. Die Sprache der ältesten deutschen Urkunden der Stadt Jena. Diss. Jena.

HARTUNG, W. 1964. Die zusammengesetzten Sätze des Deutschen. 2nd ed. 1966. (= Studia Grammatica 4.) Berlin.

——. 1967. Möglichkeiten der Darstellung des Verhältnisses zwischen einfachem Satz und Satzkomplex in der generativen Grammatik. Berlin, Arbeitsstelle für Strukturelle Grammatik. (Mimeo).

HASELBACH, G. 1966. Grammatik und Sprachstruktur. Karl Ferdinand Beckers Beitrag zur allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft in historischer und systematischer Sicht. Berlin.

HEBERLING, E. 1947. Etymologische und philologische Untersuchungen im Anschluß an einige Tanzwörter Neidharts und seiner Schule. Diss. Münster.

HEFELE, F. 1955. Lehren eines Urkundenbuches für die deutsche Sprachforschung. ArchZ 50 1.261f.

HEFFNER, R.-M. 1961. A word-index to the texts of Steinmeyer, 'Die kleineren althochdeutschen Sprachdenkmäler'. Madison.

—— and K. PETERSEN. 1942. A word-index to Des Minnesangs Frühling. Wisconsin Univ. (Masch.)

——, and W. LEHMANN. 1950. A word-index to the poems of Walther von der Vogelweide. 2nd ed. Univ. of Wisconsin Press. Madison.

HEIDOLPH, K.E. 1966. Kontextbeziehungen zwischen Sätzen in einer generativen Grammatik. Kybernetica 2.274–81. (Gedruckte Fassung des Vortrages am Prager Kolloquium über algebraische Linguistik und Maschinenübersetzung, 18–22 September 1964; = Steger 1970).

——. 1969. Nominalgruppenstruktur und Wortstellung im Deutschen. Studia Grammatica 8. Berlin.

HEIKE, G. 1961. Das phonologische System des Deutschen als binäres System. (= Steger 1970: 454–67.

——. 1967. Quantitative diachronische Vergleichsmerkmale. ZMaF 34.30–40.

HEIMPLÄTZER, F. 1953. Die Metaphorik des Herzens im Minnesang des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Heidelberg.

HELM, K., and E. A. EBBINGHAUS. 1961. Abriß der mittelhochdeutschen Grammatik. 2nd ed. Tübingen.

HEMPEL, H. 1951. Der 'zwîfel' bei Wolfram und anderweitig. Erbe der Vergangenheit. Festschrift für Karl Helm, 157–87. Tübingen.

——. 1966. Über Bedeutung und Ausdruckswert der deutschen Vergangenheitstempora. H. Hempel, Kleine Schriften zur Vollendung seines 80. Lebensjahres, ed. by H. M. Heinrichs, 399–421. Heidelberg.

HENNE, H. 1968. Deutsche Lexikographie und Sprachnorm im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Wortgeographie und Gesellschaft, ed. by W. Mitzka, 80–114. Berlin.

HENZEN, W. 1956. Der heutige Bestand der Verben mit *ver-*. Festgabe für Th. Frings, 173–89. Berlin.

——. 1958. Inhaltsbezogene Wortbildung. ASNS 194. 1–23.

——. 1959. Eine Systematik der infinitiven Verbalformen. Mu 115–227.

——. 1965. Deutsche Wortbildung. 3rd ed. Tübingen.

——. 1969. Die Bezeichnung von Richtung und Gegenrichtung im Deutschen. Studien zu Umfang und Ausnützung der mit Adverbien der Richtung zusammengesetzten Wortbildungsgruppen. Tübingen.

HERINGER, H.-J. 1967. Nullwertige Verben. Wertigkeiten und nullwertige Verben im Deutschen. ZDS 23.13–34.

——. 1970. Theorie der deutschen Syntax. Linguistische Reihe 1, ed. by K. Baumgärtner, P. von Polenz, and H. Steger. Munich.

HERMANS, G. 1953. *List*. Studien zur Bedeutungs- und Problemgeschichte. Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)

HINTZE, F. 1950. Zur Frage der monophonematischen Wertung. SL 4.

HIRT, H. 1925. Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. 2nd ed. Handbuch des deutschen Unterrichts 4,1. Munich.

HOBERG, R. 1970. Die Lehre vom sprachlichen Feld. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Geschichte, Methodik und Anwendung. Sprache der Gegenwart, vol. 11. Düsseldorf.

HOFMANN, D. 1962. Die *K*-Diminutiva im Nordfriesischen und in verwandten Sprachen. Gießen.

HOLLANDS, M. 1948. Zur Etymologie und Bedeutungsgeschichte einiger alter Tanzwörter. Diss. Münster.

HOPPE, A. 1955. Inhalte und Ausdrucksformen der deutschen Sprache. Frankfurt/M.

HORACEK, B. 1952. Zur Wortstellung in Wolframs Parzival. AÖAW 19.270–99.

——. 1964. Kunstprinzipien der Satzgestaltung. Studien zu einem inhaltsbezogenen Syntax der deutschen Dichtersprache. Sb *Y*AW 243/5.

——. 1968. Kunstprinzipien der Satz- und Versgestaltung. Studien zu einer inhaltsbezogenen Syntax und Metrik der deutschen Dichtersprache. SbÖAW 258/1. Vienna.

HRUBY, A. 1968. Historische Semantik in Morungens 'Narzissuslied' und die Interpretation des Textes. DVS 42.1–22.

HÜNERT-HOFMANN, E. 1968. Soziologie und Mundartforschung. Wortgeographie und Gesellschaft, ed. by W. Mitzka, 3–9. Berlin.

HUNDSNURSCHER, F. 1968. Das System der Partikelverben mit *aus-* in der Gegenwartssprache. Göppingen.

IPSEN, G. 1930. Sprachphilosophie der Gegenwart. Berlin.

——. 1932. Der neue Sprachbegriff. ZfDK 46.

ISING, E. 1960. Zur Entwicklung der Sprachauffassung in der Frühzeit der deutschen Grammatik. FUF 34.367–74.

ISING, G. 1956. Die Erfassung der deutschen Sprache des ausgehenden 17. Jahrhunderts in den Wörterbüchern Matthias Kramers und Kaspar Stielers. Berlin.

JANSMA, T.S., and W. LAUR. 1964. De Betrekkingen tussen Nederland en het Oostzeegebied weerspiegeld in de Plaatsnamen. Amsterdam.

JAUCH, E.A. 1951. Untersuchung der Begriffe *tugend, saelde, triuwe* and *edelez herze* im Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg. Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)

JOOS, M. 1957. Readings in linguistics. Washington.

JUNGANDREAS, W. 1946–49. Geschichte der deutschen und englischen Sprache. 3 vols. Göttingen. (1947 = Vol. 2, Geschichte der deutschen Sprache.)

KÄMPF, G. 1966. Die Sprache der 'Unterweisung zur Vollkommenheit'. Ein Beitrag zur Sprachgeschichte der thüringischen literarischen Texte des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Jena. (Masch.)

KARL, E. 1952. *Minne* und Ritterepik bei Wolfram von Eschenbach. Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)

KARSTIEN, C. 1939. Historische deutsche Grammatik. Bd. 1 Geschichtliche Einleitung, Lautlehre. (German. Bibliothek, 1. Abt. 1. Reihe Bd. 20). Heidelberg.

KAUFMANN, G. 1967. Grammatik der deutschen Grundwortarten. Munich.

KAYSER, W. 1950. Wandlungen im Gebrauch der verbalen Präfixe in der deutschen Sprache des 18. Jahrhunderts. BF 11.141–68.

KEIL, G., et al., eds. 1968. Fachliteratur des Mittelalters. Festschrift für G. Eis. Stuttgart.

KEMPCKE, G. 1965, 1966. Die Bedeutungsgruppen der verbalen Kompositionspartikeln *an-* und *auf-* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht. PBB(H) 87.392–426, 88.276–305.

KEMPER, R. 1962. Noch einmal *wildenære*. Euphorion 56.146–64.

KETTMANN, G. 1967a. Die Kursächsische Kanzleisprache zwischen 1486 und 1546. Studien zum Aufbau und zur Entwicklung. Berlin.

——. 1967b. Zur schreibsprachlichen Überlieferung Wittenbergs in der Lutherzeit. (Stadt- und Schreibsprache im Frühneuhochdeutsch). PBB(H) 89.76–120.

KIENLE, R. VON. 1960. Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Deutschen. 2nd ed. 1969. Tübingen.

KING, R.D. 1966. On preferred phonemicizations for statistical studies: phoneme frequencies in German. Phonetica 15.22–31.

KIRCHHOFF, H.G. 1957. Zur deutschsprachigen Urkunde des 13. Jahrhunderts. ArchD 3.287–327.

KIRK, H. 1923. An introduction to the historical study of New High German. Manchester.

KLAPPENBACH, R. 1945. Zur Urkundensprache des 13. Jahrhunderts. PBB 68. 185–264.

——. 1960. Gliederung des deutschen Wortschatzes der Gegenwart. DU 12.29–45.

——, and W. STEINITZ, eds. 1964. Wörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Vol. 1: A–deutsch. Berlin.

KLEIBER, W. 1965. Urbare als sprachgeschichtliche Quelle, Möglichkeiten und Methoden der Auswertung. Vorarbeiten und Studien zur Vertiefung der Südwestdeutschen Sprachgeschichte, ed. by F. Maurer, 151–243. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg, Reihe B, Band 33.) Stuttgart.

KLUGE, F. 1918. Von Luther bis Lessing. 5th ed. Leipzig.

——. 1925a. Deutsche Sprachgeschichte. 2nd ed. Leipzig.

——. 1925b. Abriß der deutschen Wortbildungslehre. 2nd ed. Halle/Saale.

——. 1926. Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte. 3rd ed. by Sütterlin and Ochs. Halle.

——. 1963. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 19th ed. by W. Mitzka. Berlin.

KOEKKOEK, B.J. 1958. Amerikanische Arbeiten zur Phonologie des Deutschen. ZMaF 26. 42–57.

KOLB, H. 1952. Untersuchungen zur Terminologie der höfischen Lyrik. Diss. Berlin. (Masch.)

KORAKOVA, L.S. 1961. Nabljudenija nad stroeniem predloženija v nemeckom jazyke načala XVI veka. (Beobachtungen zum Satzbau in der deutschen Sprache am Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts.) Voprosy teorii jazyka, 83–97. Leningrad.

KÖRNER, M. 1964. Die Stellung des finiten Verbums in den aussagenden Hauptsätzen von Gottfrieds Tristan. (Masch.) Diss. Vienna.

KRAMER, R. 1950. Rein und unrein. (Masch.) Diss. Bonn.

KRANZMAYER, E. 1950. Die steirische Reimchronik Ottokars und ihre Sprache. SbÖAW 226/4. Vienna.

——. 1956. Historische Lautgeographie des gesamtbairischen Dialektraumes. Vienna.

——. 1960. Die bairischen Kennwörter und ihre Geschichte. Vienna.

KRATZ, H. 1960. The phonemic approach to Umlaut in Old High German and Old Norse. JEGP 59.

KRÖMER, G. 1959–64. Die Präpositionen in der hochdeutschen Genesis und Exodus nach den verschiedenen Überlieferungen. PBB(H) 81.323–87 (1959), 82.261–300 (1960), 83.117–50 (1961), 84.67–119 (1962), 86.403–55 (1964).

KUHN, HG. 1951. *Minne* und *reht*. Studien zur deutschen Philologie. Festschrift für Friedrich Panzer, 29–37. Heidelberg.

KUHN, H. 1951–52. Review of Frings, Grundlegung einer Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. ADA 65.53–65.

——. 1952. Minnesangs Wende. (2nd ed. 1967.) Tübingen.

KUNISCH, H. 1929. Das Wort *Grund* in der Sprache der Mystik des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts. Münster.

KÜPPER, H. 1963–67. Wörterbuch der deutschen Umgangssprache. 5 vols., 3rd ed. Hamburg.

——. 1968. Handliches Wörterbuch der deutschen Alltagssprache. Hamburg.

KURRELMEYER, W. 1948. Early sixteenth century German lexicography. MLN 63.289–99.

KURTH, R. 1953. Über den Gebrauch der Bildungen auf *-ei*, *-erei* und *-elei*. PBB(H) 75.442–51.

LANG, W. 1961. Der Konjunktiv im Deutschen und sein Widerspiel. DU 13.26–55.

——. 1963. Zur geschichtlichen Deutung der Konjunktive. DU 15.67–76.

LANGEN, A. 1954. Der Wortschatz des deutschen Pietismus. Tübingen.

——. 1957. Deutsche Sprachgeschichte vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart. (= Stammler 1957: 1.931–1396.)

LANGENBRUCH, TH. 1968. Lokaladverbien in der generativen Grammatik. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik, Papier 8.

LEE, A. VAN DER. 1950. Der Stil von Hartmanns Erec, verglichen mit dem der älteren Epik. Diss. Utrecht.

LEIER, M. 1965. Ansätze zur Begriffssprache der deutschen Mystik in der geistlichen Prosa des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Hamburg.

LEOPOLD, W.E. 1929. Inner form. Lg 5.

——. 1948. German *ch*. Lg 24. 179–81.

LESOT, J. 1968. Zur Integration der Semantik in der Transformationsgrammatik. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik, Papier 8.

LEUTHOLD, G.R. 1953. *Gnade* und *Huld*. Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)

LEWIS, G.R., and L.W. TOSH. 1963. Report on German noun coding. Linguistics Research Center. Univ. of Texas. Austin.

LEXER, M. 1959. Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch. 29th ed. Stuttgart.

——. 1965. Ansätze zur Begriffssprache der deutschen Mystik in der geistlichen Prosa des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Hamburg.

LEYS, O. 1965. De eigennaam als linguistisch teken. MVN 41.1–81.

——. 1966. Der Eigenname in seinem formalen Verhältnis zum Appellativ. BNF 1.113–23.

——. 1967. Die Funktion des Artikels beim Eigennamen. Onomastica Slavogermanica 3.

LINDGREN, K.B. 1953. Die Apokope des mittelhochdeutschen *-e* in seinen verschiedenen Funktionen. Diss. Helsinki.

——. 1957. Über den oberdeutschen Präteritumschwund. Helsinki-Wiesbaden.

——. 1961. Die Ausbreitung der neuhochdeutschen Diphthongierung bis 1500. AASF, Ser. B., Vol. 123/2. Helsinki.

——. 1966. Methodische Probleme der Syntax des Infinitivs. WW 16/3.156–65.

——. 1967. Syntaktische Probleme beim deutschen Infinitiv. II: Der Infinitiv außerhalb der Prädikatssphäre. NPhM 68.69–86.

LIPPKA, E.R. 1963. Zum Stilproblem in Wolfram's 'Parzival'. Bericht über den Stand der Forschung. JEGP 62.597–610.

LLOYD, A.L. 1962. On German sentence structure. GQ 35.511–8.

LÜDTKE, H. 1959. Deutsche [x] und [ç] in diachronisch-phonologischer Betrachtung. Phonetica 4.178–83.

——. 1968. Ausbreitung der neuhochdeutschen Diphthongierung? ZMaF 35.97–109.

LÜERS, G. 1966. Die Sprache der deutschen Mystik des Mittelalters im Werke der Mechthild von Magdeburg. 2nd ed. Darmstadt.

MACKENSEN, L. 1956. Die deutsche Sprache unserer Zeit. Heidelberg.

MAIER, G.E. 1955. Die Feldtheorie und ihr Gegensatz zu den tatsächlichen Sprachgegebenheiten untersucht an Wörtern des Freudebereichs in Gottfrieds 'Tristan', Hartmanns 'Armen Heinrich' und 'Iwein' und im 'Nibelungenlied' (mit ergiebigem Literaturverzeichnis). Diss. Cologne.

MARACHE, M. 1960. Le composé verbal en ge- et ses fonctions grammaticales en moyen haut allemand. Etude fondée sur les 'Sermons' de Berthold von Regensburg et sur l' 'Iwein' de Hartmann. Thèse Paris (Germanica 1). Paris.

MARCHAND, H. 1955a. Synchronic analysis and word-formation. CFS 13.7–18.

——. 1955b. Notes on nominal compounds in present-day English. Word 11. 216–27.

MARTINET, A. 1939. Un ou deux phonèmes? AL 1.

——. 1949. Occlusives and affricates with reference to some problems of Romance phonology. Word 5. 116–22.

MARTY, A. 1926. Über Wert und Methode einer beschreibenden Bedeutungslehre. Aus A. Marty's Nachlaß, ed. by O. Funke. Reichenberg.

MASAŘIK, Z. 1966. Die mittelalterliche deutsche Kanzleisprache Süd- und Mittelmährens. Břno.

MATER, E. 1965. Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Leipzig.

——. 1966–67. Deutsche Verben. 3 vols. Leipzig.

MAURER, F. 1924. Zur Anfangsstellung des Verbs im Deutschen. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel, 141–84. Heidelberg.

——. 1926. Untersuchungen über die deutsche Verbstellung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Heidelberg.

——. 1934. Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. Germanische Philologie. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel, 201–28. Heidelberg.

——. 1950. *Rechte Minne* bei Heinrich von Veldeke. ASNS 187.1–9.

——. 1956. Zur oberrheinischen Sprachgeschichte. RhVJ 21.1–10.

——. 1963a. Dichtung und Sprache des Mittelalters. Bern and Munich.
——. 1963b. 'Tugend' und 'Ehre'. Dichtung und Sprache des Mittelalters, 335–45. Bern and Munich.
——. 1964a. Volkssprache. 2nd ed. WW Beiheft 9. Düsseldorf.
——. 1964b. Leid. Studien zur Bedeutungs- und Problemgeschichte, besonders in den großen Epen der staufischen Zeit. 3rd ed.; 1st ed. 1951. (Bibliotheca Germanica, 1.) Bern and Munich.
——, ed. 1965. Vorarbeiten und Studien zur Vertiefung der südwestdeutschen Sprachgeschichte. (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für geschichtliche Landeskunde in Baden-Württemberg, Reihe B, Band 33.) Stuttgart.
——. 1968. Über *Adel* und *edel* in altdeutscher Dichtung. Adel und Kirche. G. Tellenbach zum 65. Geburtstag dargebracht, 1–6. Freiburg/Br.
——, and F. STROH, 1959. Deutsche Wortgeschichte. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Berlin.
MCLINTOCK, D.R. 1961. Die unumgelauteten Praeteritopraesentia und der Synkretismus im deutschen Verbalsystem. PBB(T) 83.271–7.
MEISSBURGER, G. 1965. Urkunde und Mundart. (= Maurer 1965: 47–103.) (For particular information see W. Kleiber 1965.)
MEIXNER, W., and D. RUPP. Deutsche Relativsätze bei Personalpronomina der 1. und 2. Person. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik. Papier 8.
MERLINGEN, W. 1960. Über Ein- und Zweiphonemigkeit. ZPhon 13.
METTKE, H. 1964. Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. Halle.
——. 1965. Probleme und Aufgaben der deutschen Sprachgeschichte. WZUJ 14.441–6.
MEYER, L. 1951. Studien zur geistlichen Bildsprache im Werk der Mechthild von Magdeburg. Diss. Göttingen.
MEYER, M. 1946. Der Begriff *edelez herze* in Gottfrieds von Straßburg 'Tristan und Isolde'. Diss. Bonn.
MEYER-INGWERSEN, A. 1968. Identitäten bei Satzeinbettungen. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik. Papier 8.
MEZGER, F. 1956. Zur Frühgeschichte von *Freiheit* und *Frieden*. Fragen und Forschungen im Bereich und Umkreis der germanischen Philologie. Festgabe für Theodor Frings zum 70. Geburtstag, 12–24. Berlin.
MICHEL, W.-D. 1959. Die graphische Entwicklung der *s*-Laute im Deutschen PBB(H) 81.456–80.
MICHELS, V. 1924. Deutsch. Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft. Festschrift für Wilhelm Streitberg. Heidelberg.
MITZKA, W. 1943. Deutsche Mundarten. Heidelberg.
——. 1959. Grundzüge nordostdeutscher Sprachgeschichte. 2nd ed. Marburg.
——, ed. 1968. Wortgeographie und Gesellschaft. Festgabe für L. E. Schniett. Berlin.
MOLLAY, K. 1967–68. Das Wörterbuch des Frühneuhochdeutschen in Ungarn. Verhandlungen des 2. intern. Dialektologenkongresses, Marburg/Lahn 5.-10. Sept. 1965, ed. by L.E. Schmitt, 569–73. Wiesbaden.

MORCINIEC, N. 1958. Zur phonologischen Wertung der deutschen Affrikaten und Diphthonge. ZPhon 11.49–66.
——. 1960a. Theorie und Praxis der monophonematischen Wertung. (Zur Phonologie der deutschen Diphthonge.) Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny 7.
——. 1960b. Ein Phonem oder zwei? Lingua 9. 288–95.
——. 1960c. Wort, Wortzusammensetzung und Wortgruppen. Germania Wratislaviensia 4.
MORET, A. 1949. Qu'est-ce que la *Minne*? EGerm 4. 1–12.
MORSBACH, L. 1931. Innere Sprachform. Anglia 55. 1–3.
MOSER, HG. 1950–51. Probleme der Periodisierung des Deutschen. GRM 1.296–308.
——. 1951. Die Entstehung der neuhochdeutschen Einheitssprache. DU 3/1.58–74.
MOSER, H. 1952. Schichten und Perioden des Mittelhochdeutschen. WW 2.321–8.
——. 1957 (1968). Deutsche Sprachgeschichte, mit einer Einführung in die Fragen der Sprachbetrachtung. 3rd rev. ed. Stuttgart.
——, ed. 1965. Das Ringen um eine neue deutsche Grammatik. 2nd ed. Darmstadt.
——. 1966. Deutsche Sprachgeschichte der älteren Zeit. Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, vol. 1. Reprint of the 2nd ed., 621–854. Berlin.
——. 1969. Deutsche Sprachgeschichte. 6th ed. Tübingen.
——, and H. STOPP 1967. Flexionsklassen der mittelhochdeutschen Substantive in synchronischer Sicht. ZDPh 86.70–101.
MOSER, V. 1929–51. Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik I, 1/3. Heidelberg.
MOSSELMAN, F. 1953. Der Wortschatz Gottfrieds von Straßburg. The Hague.
MOTSCH, W. 1962. Zur Stellung der 'Wortbildung' in einem formalen Modell. Studia Grammatica 1.13ff. Berlin.
——. 1964. Syntax des deutschen Adjektivs. 2nd ed. 1965. Studia Grammatica 3. Berlin.
——. 1965. Untersuchungen zur Apposition im Deutschen. 3rd ed. 1966. Studia Grammatica 5. 87–132. Berlin.
——. 1966. Zur Stellung der Wortbildung in einem formalen Sprachmodell. 3rd ed. Studia Grammatica 1. Berlin.
——. 1967. Können attributive Adjektive durch Transformationen erklärt werden? FLing 1.23–48.
MOULTON, W.G. 1961. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Volkalsystems. PBB(T) 83.1–35.
——. 1965. Die Schweizerdeutsche Hiatusdiphthongierung in phonologischer Sicht. Festschrift Henzen, 115–29. Bern.
——. 1967–68. The mapping of phonemic systems. Verhandlungen des zweiten internationalen Dialektologenkongresses Marburg/Lahn 1965, ed. by L.E. Schmitt, 574–91. Marburg/Lahn.
MÜLLER, M. 1953. Der Stilwandel von der höfischen zur späthöfischen Dichtung gezeigt am Tristan Heinrichs von Freiberg. Diss. Munich. (Masch.)
NEUMANN, H. 1960. Sprache und Reim in den judendeutschen Gedichten des Cam-

bridger Codex T-S.10. K.22. Indogermanica. Festschrift für W. Krause, 145–65. Heidelberg.

NICKEL, G., and K. H. WAGNER. 1968. Contrastive linguistics and language teaching. IRAL 6/3.233–55.

NORDIN, P. G. 1945. Die Zusammensetzung von Adjektiv oder Adverb mit Adjektiv oder Partizip im Spätmittelhochdeutschen. Diss. Lund.

OCHIAI, Y. 1966. Prinzip und Prozeß der Darstellung von stimmlichen und phonemischen Qualitäten deutscher Vokale. Phonetica 14.20–35.

OEHMANN, E. 1953. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Suffixes *-ieren*. NPhM 54.159–76.

——. 1962. Die Pluralformen auf *-s* in der deutschen Substantivflexion. ZDA 99.228–30.

OKSAAR, E. 1965. Mittelhochdeutsch. Texte, Kommentare, Sprechkunde, Wörterbuch. Stockholm.

PAUL, H. 1916–20. Deutsche Grammatik. Vols, 1–5. Halle.

——. 1920. Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte. 5th ed. Halle.

——. 1957. Deutsches Wörterbuch. 5th ed., completely reedited by W. Betz. Tübingen.

——, and L. E. SCHMITT. 1950. Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. 15th ed. Tübingen.

——, and W. MITZKA. 1966. Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. 19th ed. 2nd reprint. Tübingen.

——, H. MOSER, and I. SCHRÖBLER. 1969. Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. 20th ed. Tübingen.

PENZL, H. 1949. Umlaut and secondary Umlaut in Old High German. Lg 25. 223–40.

PETERS, C. 1955. Über Wortfelder und Wortinhalte (untersucht an nhd. Körperwörtern). Phil. Diss. Bonn (Masch.).

PFALZ, A. 1954. Zur Phonetik des Mittelhochdeutschen. Festschrift für Dietrich Kralik, 239–41. Horn.

PZANNER, J. 1954. Die deutsche Schreibsprache in Nürnberg von ihrem ersten Auftreten bis zum Ausgang des 14. Jahrhunderts. Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg 45.148–207.

PFLEIDERER, W. 1940. Der deutsche Satzplan in seinen Grundzügen. Neue Satzlehre, ed. F. Rahn. Frankfurt/M.

——. 1959. Das Zeitwort im Deutschen und die Grundlagen des Satzes. DU 11. (= Moser 1965, revised.)

PHILIPP, M. 1965. Le système phonologique du parler de Blaesheim. Nancy.

——. 1968. Phonologie des graphies et des rimes. Recherches structurales sur l'alsacien de Thomas Murner. Paris.

Phonologie der Gegenwart, ed. by J. Hamm et al. 1967. (WSlJb. Erg. Bd. 6.) Graz.

PILCH, H. 1964. Phonemtheorie I. Bibliotheca phonetica. Fasc. 1. Basel-New York.

——. 1966. Das Lautsystem der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache. ZMaF 33. 247–66.

PLEUSER, CHR. 1967. Die Benennungen und der Begriff des Leides bei J. Tauler. Diss. Freiburg/Br.

POLENZ, P. VON. 1963. Funktionsverben im heutigen Deutsch. Sprache in der rationalisierten Welt. WW Beiheft 5.

——. 1966. Zur Quellenwahl für Dokumentation und Erforschung der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. WW 16.3–13.

——. 1967. Fremdwort und Lehnwort sprachwissenschaftlich betrachtet. Mu 77. 65–80.

——. 1968a. Ableitungsstrukturen deutscher Verben. ZDS 24.1–15.

——. 1968b. Wortbildung als Wortsoziologie. Wortgeographie und Gesellschaft, ed. by W. Mitzka, 10–27. Berlin.

——. 1968. Sprachkritik und Sprachwissenschaft. Sprachnorm, Sprachpflege, Sprachkritik. Sprache der Gegenwart, vol. 2.159–84. Düsseldorf.

PORZIG, W. 1923. Der Begriff der inneren Sprachform. IF 41. 150–69.

——. 1924. Aufgaben indogermanischen Syntax. Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft. Festschrift für W. Streitberg. Heidelberg.

——. 1934. Wesenhafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen. PBB 58.70–97.

——. 1950. Das Wunder der Sprache. Munich.

POWITZ, J. 1959. Das deutsche Wörterbuch Johann Leonhardt Frischs. Berlin.

QUINT, J. 1928. Die Sprache Meister Eckeharts als Ausdruck seiner mystischen Geisteswelt. DVLG 6.671–701.

——. 1953. Mystik und Sprache. DVLG 27.48–77.

RAHN, F., ed. 1940. Neue Satzlehre. Frankfurt/M.

'*Regeler*'. 1962. Studia Grammatica 1. Berlin.

REGULA, M. 1968. Kurzgefaßte erklärende Satzkunde des Neuhochdeutschen. Bern and Munich.

RENICKE, H. 1957. Das neuhochdeutsche Passiv. ZDPh 76.307–17.

REXROTH, K. H. 1959–60. Die Entstehung der städtischen Kanzlei in Konstanz. Untersuchungen zum deutschsprachigen Urkundenwesen des 13. Jahrhunderts. ArchD 5–6.202–307.

RIECHERT, I. 1952. Studien zur Auffassung von *êre* bei Konrad von Würzburg und Rudolf von Ems. Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)

RIEMEN, A. 1955. Bedeutung und Gebrauch der Heldenwörter im mittelhochdeutschen Epos. Diss. Köln.

RIES, J. 1927. Was ist Syntax? Ein kritischer Versuch. (1st ed. 1894.) Marburg and Prague.

RÖLL, W. 1966. Zum Konsonantensystem der Cambridger Handschrift. ZMaF 33.144–6.

ROHRER, CHR. 1968. Satzkonjunktion, Existenzquantor und Relativsätze. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik, Papier 8.

ROOTH, E. 1962. Huvuddragen av det tyska språkets historia. 3rd ed. Lund.

ROSENGREN, I. 1966. Semantische Strukturen. Eine quantitative Distributionsanalyse

einiger mittelhochdeutscher Adjektive. (Lunder Germanist. Forschungen 38.) Lund.

ROSENQUIST, A. 1954. Über die mittelhochdeutschen Wörter auf *-ier, -ieraere, -ierre.* NPhM 55.81–134.

RUDOLF, R. 1962. Die Anfänge der deutschen Urkundensprache in Südböhmen. ZMaF 29.97–133.

RUH, K. 1955. David von Augsburg und die Entstehung eines franziskanischen Schrifttums in deutscher Sprache. Munich.

——. 1956. Bonaventura deutsch. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Franziskanermystik und -scholastik. (Bibliotheca Germanica 7.) Bern.

SALESKI, R. 1926. Auf dem Wege zu einer nicht-historischen Sprachwissenschaft. Monatsheft für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik. Milwaukee.

SALTVEIT, L. 1956–57. Einige Bemerkungen zum deutschen Futurum. ZDA 87. 213–28.

——. 1960. Besitzt die deutsche Sprache ein Futur? DU 12.46–65.

——. 1962. Studien zum deutschen Futur. Bergen and Oslo.

——. 1968. Akkusativ und Dativ in ihren Beziehungen zum Verb. Sprachnorm, Sprachpflege, Sprachkritik. Sprache der Gegenwart, vol. 2.251–67. Düsseldorf.

SALZER, A. 1953. Der Schicksalsbegriff in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung (*gelücke, heil, saelde*). Berlin (Masch.)

SANDERS, W. 1965. Glück. Zur Herkunft und Bedeutungsentwicklung eines mittelalterlichen Schicksalbegriffs. Cologne and Graz.

SARAN, F. 1964. Das Übersetzen aus dem Mittelhochdeutschen. Reedited by B. Nagel. 4th ed. Tübingen.

SAYCE, O. 1959. Der Begriff *edelez herze* im Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg. DVLG 33.398–413.

SCHÄDLICH, R. 1965. Zur Syntax des Adverbials im Deutschen. Diss. Berlin. (Mimeo).

SCHAUBER, J. 1945. Entwicklung des *Minne*begriffs vor Walther. Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)

SCHERINGER, R. 1934. Innere Form. Diss. Leipzig.

SCHILDT, J. 1965. Zum Funktionsfeld der lokalen Präpositionen im Ostmitteldeutschen von 1200–1400. F&F 39/1.15–19.

SCHIRMUNSKI, V. M. 1957. Probleme der vergleichenden Grammatik der deutschen Mundarten. PBB(H) 79. 351–87. Sonderband.

——. 1962. Deutsche Mundartenkunde. Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre der deutschen Mundarten. VIDSL 25. Berlin.

——. 1965. Istorija nemeckogo jazyka. Moscow.

SCHIROKAUER, A. 1941. Zur Geschichte des Artikels im Deutschen. Monatshefte 33.349–55.

——. 1945. Die Anfänge der neuhochdeutschen Lexikographie. MLQ 6.71–5.

SCHMID, H. 1953. Die St. Galler Urkundensprache in der 2. Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Zürich.

SCHMIDT, L., ed. 1968–69. Wortfeldforschung. Zur Geschichte und Theorie des sprachlichen Feldes. (Wege der Forschung 250.) Darmstadt.

SCHMIDT, M. 1952. Studien zum Leidproblem bei Mechthild von Magdeburg im 'Fliessenden Licht der Gottheit'. Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)

SCHMIDT,W. 1959. Deutsche Sprachkunde. Ein Handbuch für Lehrer und Studierende. Berlin.

——. 1960. Deutsche Sprachkunde. 2nd ed. Berlin.

——. 1965. Grundfragen der deutschen Grammatik. Eine Einführung in die funktionale Sprachlehre. (2nd ed. 1966.) Berlin.

SCHMIDT-ROHR, G. 1933. Mutter Sprache. 2nd ed. Jena.

SCHMITT, L.E. 1936. Zur Entstehung und Erforschung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. ZMaF 12.193–223.

——. 1966. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Struktur der 'Neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache'. Vol. 1. (Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 36/1.) Cologne and Graz.

SCHMOLDT, B. 1954. Die deutsche Begriffssprache Meister Eckharts. Heidelberg.

SCHNEIDER, TH. 1935. Der intellektuelle Wortschatz Meister Eckharts. Berlin.

SCHNOOR, G. 1962. *Wirde-Wirdekeit.* Untersuchungen zur Bedeutungsgeschichte. Diss. Göttingen. (Masch.)

SCHOLLER, H. 1965. A word-index to the Nibelungenklage. Ann Arbor.

SCHRÖBLER, I. 1966. Vergleichendes und relatives 'und' im Mittelhochdeutschen. Festschrift für H. de Boor, 136–49. Tübingen.

SCHRÖDER, M. 1962. Die frühmittelhochdeutschen *-lich-* Bildungen. PBB(H) 83. 151–94.

SCHRÖDER, F.R. 1950–51. Morungens Dichtersprache. GRM 32.318–19.

SCHRÖDER, W. 1959a. Zu Wesen und Bedeutung des *würde* + Infinitiv-Gefüges. WW 9.70–84.

——. 1959b. Der Wortgebrauch von *riuwe* bei Hartmann und Wolfram. GRM 9.228–34.

SCHRÖDER, W. J. 1947. *Zwîvel.* Eine geistesgeschichtliche Studie über Wolframs von Eschenbach Parzival. Habil.-Schr. Rostock. (Masch.)

——. 1960. Bemerkungen zur Sprache Gottfrieds von Straßburg. Volk-Sprache-Dichtung, Festgabe für K. Wagner, 49–60. Giessen.

SCHULZ, H. 1913. Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch von Hans Schulz, fortgeführt von O. Basler. Vol. 1 Straβburg 1913, Vol. 2 Berlin 1942.

SCHULZ, O., and H. GRIESBACH. 1966. Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. 4th ed. Munich.

SCHÜRR, FR. 1923. Das Wesen der Sprache und der Sinn der Sprachwissenschaft. Marburg/Lahn.

SCHÜTZEICHEL, R. 1956. Urkundensprache und Mundart am Mittelrhein. ZDPh 75.73–82.

——. 1961. Die Grundlagen des westlichen Mitteldeutschen. Tübingen.

——. 1962. Die Kölner Schreibsprache. Aufgaben und Problembereiche der Erfor-

schung spätmittelalterlicher Schreibsprachen im Nordwesten. RhVJ 27.69–96.

SCHWARZ, E. 1936. Die Grundlagen der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. ZMaF 12.1–15.

——. 1949–56. Deutsche Namenforschung. 2 vols. Göttingen.

——. 1950. Die deutschen Mundarten. Göttingen.

——. 1951. Deutsche und Germanische Philologie. Heidelberg.

——. 1957a. Orts- und Personennamen. Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, ed. by Wolfgang Stammler 1.1523–98. 2nd ed. Berlin.

——. 1957b. Die Herkunft der Siebenbürger und Zipser Sachsen. (Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks, Reihe B, Nr. 8.) Munich.

——. 1961. Die Ortsnamen der Sudetenländer als Geschichtsquelle. (Handbuch der sudetendeutschen Kulturgeschichte 1.) 2nd ed. Munich.

——. 1962. Sudetendeutsche Sprachräume. (Handbuch der sudetendeutschen Kulturgeschichte 2.) 2nd ed. Munich.

——. 1967. Kurze deutsche Wortgeschichte. Darmstadt.

SCHWARZ, H. 1959. Leitmerkmale sprachlicher Felder. Ein Beitrag zur Verfahrensweise der Gliederungsforschung. Sprache — Schlüssel zur Welt. Festschrift für Leo Weisgerber, 245–55. Düsseldorf.

SCHWARZ, W. 1966. Prinzipielle Erwägungen zur Untersuchung der Cambridger Handschrift T-S10. K.22. ZMaF 33. 138–44.

SCHWEIKLE, G. 1963. *Minne* und *Mâze*. Zu *Aller werdekeit ein füegerinne* (Walther 46, 32). DVLG 37.498–528.

SCHWERTE, H., and H. SCHANZE. 1968. Indices zur deutschen Literatur: Index 1: Novalis, Heinrich von Ofterdingen. Frankfurt.

SCHWINGER, R. 1934. Innere Form. Ein Beitrag zur Definition des Begriffes auf Grund seiner Geschichte von Shaftesbury bis Wilhelm von Humboldt. Munich.

SCHWITZGEBEL, H. 1958. Kanzleisprache und Mundart in Ingelheim im ausgehenden Mittelalter. Karlsruhe.

SEIFFERT, L. 1968. Wortfeldtheorie und Strukturalismus. Studien zum Sprachgebrauch Freidanks. (Studien zur Poetik und Geschichte der Literatur, vol. 4.) Stuttgart.

SEILER, H. 1968. Zur Erforschung des lexikalischen Feldes. Sprachnorm, Sprachpflege, Sprachkritik. Sprache der Gegenwart, vol. 2. Düsseldorf.

SENN, A. 1943. Problems of Middle High German. Monatshefte 35.135–7.

SEPPÄNEN, L. 1967. Zur Liebesterminologie in mittelhochdeutschen geistlichen Texten. Tampere.

——, and K. VALTASAARI. 1953. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Suffixes *-ieren*. NphM 54.159–76.

SINGER, H. 1965. Zur Struktur des Zeichenfeldes beim Vokalismus der Hs 64 St. Georgen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Phonologie. (= Maurer 1965: 131–50.) (For particular information see W. Kleiber 1965.)

——. 1968. Stilistik und Linguistik. Festgabe für Friedrich Maurer zum 70. Geburtstag, 69–82. Düsseldorf.

SKÁLA, E. 1962. Deklination von Fremd- und Lehnwörtern sowie Eigennamen in der Egerer Kanzlei von 1500–1600. PBB(H) 84.199–223.

——. 1967. Die Entwicklung der Kanzleisprache in Eger 1310 bis 1660. VIDSL 35.

SMET, G. DE. 1965. Der Stand der Herkunftsforschung bei den Deutschen Siebenbürgens. Siebenbürg.-Sächs. Hauskalender. Munich.

SONDEREGGER, ST. 1959. Die Umlautfrage in den germanischen Dialekten. Kratylos 4.

SPARMANN, H. 1961. Die Pronomina in der mittelhochdeutschen Urkundensprache. PBB(H) 83.1–108.

——. 1968. Häufigkeitsuntersuchungen an neuen und alten Wortbildungen in der Gegenwartssprache. ZPhon 21.467–80.

SPECKENBACH, K. 1965. Studien zum Begriff *edelez herze* im Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg. Munich.

SPERBER, H., and P. VON POLENZ. 1966. Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. 5th ed. Berlin.

SPIEWOK, W. 1963. Zum Begriff *edelez herze* bei Gottfried von Straßburg. WB 9.27–41.

SPITZER, L. 1958. Zur 'Inversion' beim Komparativ. ZDPh 77.63–5.

Sprache und Bedeuting. 1930. Blätter für Deutsche Philosophie 4, with contributions by G. Ipsen, L. Weisgerber, F. Neumann, H. Lipps, W. Porzig, H. Ammann.

SPYCHER, C. 1955, 1956, 1957. Die Struktur des Adjektivs auf *-ig* und *-lich* in der deutschen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Orbis IV.74–90, VI.410–26.

STACKMANN, K. 1955. Rhetoricae artis pratica fontalisque Medulla. Zur Theorie und Praxis des Blümens bei H. v. Mügeln. Festgruß für H. Pyritz, 21–6. Heidelberg.

——. 1958. Der Spruchdichter H. v. Mügeln. Heidelberg.

STAMMLER, W., ed. 1957. Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß. 3 vols. 2nd ed. Berlin.

STEER, G. 1966. Scholastische Gnadenlehre in mittelhochdeutscher Sprache. Munich.

STEGER, H. 1962a. Franken und die mittelalterliche Ostsiedlung im Lichte der Mundarten. JbFL 22. 313–55.

——. 1963b. Konrad von Megenberg und die Sprache des Nürnberger Raumes im 14. Jahrhundert. ZDPh 82.63–86.

——. 1964a. Sprachnorm, Grammatik und technische Welt. Deutsch-Gefrorene Sprache in einem gefrorenem Land, ed. by F. Handt, 61–74. Berlin.

——. 1964b. Gruppensprachen. ZMaF 31. 125–38.

——. 1965. Dialektentstehung als Ergebnis von Systemmischungen. PICPS 5. 531–41. Basel and New York.

——. 1967a. Gesprochene Sprache. Zu ihrer Typik und Terminologie. Satz und Wort im heutigen Deutsch. Sprache der Gegenwart, vol. 1.259–91. Düsseldorf.

——. 1967b. Zwischen Sprache und Literatur. Göttingen.

——. 1968. Sprachraumbildung und Landesgeschichte im östlichen Franken. (Schriften des Instituts für Fränkische Landesforschung an der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg 13, ed. by G. Pfeiffer.) Neustadt/Aisch.

——. 1969a. Forschungsbericht 'gesprochene Sprache' Probleme des Deutschen als Fremdsprache, 80–99. Munich.

——, ed. 1970. Vorschläge für eine strukturale Grammatik des Deutschen. (Wege der Forschung 146.) Darmstadt.

——, and J. GRIMM. 1968. Vorreden zur deutschen Grammatik. Einleitung von H. Steger. Darmstadt.

STEINBACH, F. 1952. Deutsche Sprache und deutsche Geschichte. Bemerkungen zur 'Grundlegung einer Geschichte der deutschen Sprache' von Th. Frings. RhVJ 17.332–43. (Festschrift Th. Frings.)

STICKEL, E., and M. GRÄFE. 1966. Automatische Textzerlegung und Herstellung von Zettelregistern für das Goethe-Wörterbuch. STZ 19.247–57.

STOLTE, H. 1951. Kurze deutsche Grammatik. Auf Grund der fünfbändigen deutschen Grammatik von H. Paul. 2nd ed. Halle.

STOLZENBERG, I. 1961–62. Urkundsparteien und Urkundensprache. Ein Beitrag zur Frage des Aufkommens der deutschsprachigen Urkunden am Oberrhein. Part I. ArchD 7.214–89. Part II. ArchD 8.147–269.

STOPP, J. 1957. Indirectly compounded verbal forms in present-day German. MLR 52.355–62.

——, and H. MOSER. 1967. Flexionsklassen der mittelhochdeutschen Substantive in synchronischer Sicht. ZDPh 86.70–101.

STÖTZEL, G. 1965. Schwierigkeiten bei der sprachwissenschaftlichen Beurteilung des 'Nominalstils'. Mu 75.17–23.

——. 1966. Zum Nominalstil Meister Eckharts. Die syntaktischen Funktionen grammatischer Verbalabstrakt. WW 16.289–309.

——. 1967. Traditionelle und strukturelle Forschung auf dem Gebiet der Modalverben. Mu 77.52–7.

——. 1970. Ausdrucksseite und Inhaltsseite der Sprache. Methodenkritische Studien am Beispiel der Reflexivverben. Linguistische Reihe 3, ed. by K. Baumgärtner, P. von Polenz, and H. Steger. Munich.

STREBL, L. 1967. Zur Urkundensprache im Stift Klosterneuburg. Ein Beitrag zur Lautgeschichte der mittelbairischen Schreibsprache des 14.–16. Jahrhunderts. Mundart und Geschichte, ed. by M. Hornung, 145–61. Vienna.

STROH, F. 1934. Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Sprachphilosophie. Germanische Philologie. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel 229–58. Heidelberg.

——. 1952. Handbuch der germanischen Philologie. Berlin.

SUCHSLAND, P. 1965. Zur Sprache der Jenaer Ratsurkunden WZUJ 14.467–73.

——. 1968. Die Sprache der Jenaer Ratsurkunden. Entwicklung von Lauten und Formen von 1317–1525. Berlin.

SÜTTERLIN, L. 1924. Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuhochdeutschen Mundarten. Vol. 1. Munich.

SWINBURNE, H. 1953. Word-order and rhythm in the 'Ackermann aus Böhmen'. MLR 48.413–20.

SZADROWSKY, M. 1926–27. Zur deutschen Wortbildung. Teuth. 3.2–11.
TAMSEN, M. 1963. Die Konstruktion *wann*. Geschichte und Stilwert. ZDPh 82. 378–411.
TAUGEL, H. 1955. *Minne* bei Mechthild von Magdeburg Hadewijch. Diss. Tübingen. (Masch.)
THÜMMEL, W. 1968. Subordination und Koordination von Sätzen. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik. Papier 8.
TOLLENAERE, F. DE. 1965. Lexikographie mit Hilfe des elektronischen Informationswandlers. ZDS 21.1–19. (Lit.)
TOUBER, A.H. 1965. Textik. Zur Struktur der mittelhochdeutschen Lyrik. Nph 49.231–41.
TRIER, J. 1931a. Worte des Wissens. Marburger Universitätsbund. Marburg.
——. 1931b. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. 1st vol. Otto Behaghel, 173–200. Heidelberg.
——. 1932b. Die Idee der Klugheit in ihrer sprachlichen Entfaltung. ZfD 46.625ff.
——. 1932b. Sprachliche Felder. Zeitschrift für deutsche Bildung 8. 417–27.
——. 1934. Deutsche Bedeutungsforschung. Germanische Philologie. Festschrift für Otto Behaghel, 173–200. Heidelberg.
——. 1938. Über die Erforschung des menschenkundlichen Wortschatzes. Actes du 4e Congrès international des linguistes 1936. Copenhagen.
——. 1968. Altes und Neues vom sprachlichen Feld. (Duden-Beiträge 34.) Mannheim and Zurich.
TROST, P. 1939. Bemerkungen zum deutschen Vokalsystem. TCLP 8.319–26.
——. 1958. Systemic support for the *x*/*ç* distinction in German. Word 14. 243–6.
——. 1966. Zur phonematischen Wertung der deutschen Diphthonge. PICPS 5. 548–9.
TSCHENTSCHER, CHR. 1959. Geschichte der germanischen Bildungssilbe *-tum*. Diss. Erlangen. (Masch.)
——. 1962. Geschichte der Silbe *-tum* im Deutschen. Mu 72.1–8, 39–47, 67–78.
TSCHIRCH, F. 1966–68. Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. 2 vols. (Grundlagen der Germanistik 5.) Berlin.
TUBACH, F. 1959. The *Locus Amoenus* in the *Tristan* of Gottfried von Straßburg. Nph 43.37–42.
TWADDELL, W. F. 1938. A note on Old High German Umlaut. Monatshefte 30. 177–81.
ULVESTAD, B. 1956. The strong verb conjugation system in German. Word 12. 91–105.
——. 1960. A structural approach to the description of German word-order. Bergen and Oslo.
VACHEK, J., ed. 1964. A Prague School reader in linguistics. Bloomington, Indiana.
VAIL, C.D. 1952. The pronoun object in classical German. Essays in honour of Th. B. Hewitt, 21–32. Buffalo.

VALK, M.E. 1958. Word-index to Gottfried's Tristan. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.

VATER, H. 1963. Das System der Artikelformen im gegenwärtigen Deutsch. Tübingen.

——. 1967. Zur Tiefenstruktur deutscher Nominalphrasen. (= Steger 1970: 121–49)

——. 1968. Zum Problem der Pro-Formen in der generativen Grammatik. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik, Papier 8.

VOGT, H.L. 1961. Das mittelhochdeutsche Wörterbuch. Editionsgrundsätze und Probeartikel. ZDPh 80.253–72.

WEBER, G. 1953. Gottfrieds von Straßburg 'Tristan' und die Krise des hochmittelalterlichen Weltbildes um 1200. Vol. 1–2. Stuttgart.

WEHRLE, H. 1954. Deutscher Wortschatz. Ein Wegweiser zum treffenden Ausdruck. 11th ed. Stuttgart.

WEINHOLD, K., G. EHRISMANN, and H. MOSER. 1968. Kleine Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. 15th ed. Wien.

WEISGERBER, L. 1926. Das Problem der inneren Sprachform und seine Bedeutung für die deutsche Sprache. GRM 14.241–56.

——. 1927. Die Bedeutungslehre — ein Irrweg der Sprachwissenschaft. GRM 15.161–83.

——. 1928. Der Geruchssinn in unseren Sprachen. IF 46.121–50.

——. 1929. Muttersprache und Geistesbildung. Göttingen.

——. 1949–50. Von den Kräften der deutschen Sprache. 4 vols. Düsseldorf.

——. 1955. Das Problem *entlang* im Deutschen. Nach den Sammlungen von E. A. Meyer. MSpråk 49.229–39.

——. 1957. Sprachwissenschaftliche Methodenlehre. Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, ed. by W. Stammler, vol. 1.1–38. 2nd ed. Berlin.

——. 1957–58. Der Mensch im Akkusativ. WW 8.193–205.

——. 1962. Die ganzheitliche Behandlung eines Satzbauplans. (Er klopfte seinem Freunde auf die Schulter.) WW Beiheft 1. Düsseldorf.

——, ed. 1963. Die vier Stufen in der Erforschung der Sprachen. Sprache und Gemeinschaft, Grundlegung, vol. 2. Düsseldorf.

——. 1964a. Zur Grundlegung der ganzheitlichen Sprachauffassung. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Düsseldorf.

——. 1964b. Zum Sinnbezirk des Geschehens im heutigen Deutsch. Festschrift für Jost Trier, 23–46. Cologne and Graz.

——. 1964c. Vierstufige Wortbildungslehre. Mu 64.33–43.

WEISSBERG, J. 1963. The vowel system of MS Cambridge T–10 K22 (recte T, S. 10-) compared with Middle High German. JJewS 14. 37–51.

——. 1965. Das Konsonantensystem des 'Dukus Horant' und der übrigen Texte des Cambridger Manuskripts T.-S.10 K.22, verglichen mit dem Mittelhochdeutschen. ZMaF 32.1–40.

WELKE, K. 1965. Untersuchungen zum System der Modalverben in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung funktionaler und syntaktischer Beziehungen. Schriften zur Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommuni-

kationsforschung 10. Berlin.

WELLS, J.C. 1964. The origin of the German suffix *-heit*. Festschrift Starck, 51–5. The Hague.

WERNER, O. 1965. Vom Formalismus zum Strukturalismus in der historischen Morphologie. ZDPh 84.100–27.

WIERCINSKI, D. 1964. *Minne*. Herkunft und Anwendungsgeschichte eines Wortes. (Niederdeutsche Studien 11.) Cologne and Graz.

WIESINGER, P. 1962. Die Entwicklung von mhd. *î-û-iû* im Schlesischen. ZMaF 29. 228–58.

WIESNER, E. 1954. Vollständiges Wörterbuch zu Neidharts Liedern. Leipzig.

WILDERMUTH, R. 1952. Ulrich von Türheim und Ulrich von dem Türlin als stilistische Nachahmer Wolframs von Eschenbach. (Masch.) Diss. Tübingen.

WISBEY, R. 1964. The analysis of Middle High German texts by computer: Some lexicographical aspects. TPhS 63.28–48.

——. 1967. Vollständige Verskonkordanz zur Wiener Genesis. mit einem rückläufigen Wörterbuch zum Formenbestand. Berlin.

——. 1968a. A complete word-index to the Speculum Ecclesiae (Early Middle High German and Latin), with a reverse index to the graphic forms. Leeds.

——. 1968b. A complete concordance to the Vorau and Strassburg Alexander with a reverse index to the graphic forms, an index of rhymes and a ranking list of frequencies. Leeds.

WOLF, S.A. 1962–64. Studien zum Vokalismus des älteren Jiddisch. Phonetica 8.31–54.

WOLFF, L. 1954. Über den Rückgang des Genitivs und die Verkümmerung der partitiven Denkformen AASF 84. Festschrift Oehmann, 185–98. Helsinki.

WOOD, F.T. 1948. Word-formation in German. Charlottesville, Virginia.

WORONOW, A. 1962. Die Pluralbildung der Substantive in der deutschen Sprache des 14.–16. Jahrhunderts. (Dargestellt nach den Chroniken von Nürnberg und Augsburg). PBB(H) 84.173–98.

WUNDERLICH, D. 1968a. Pragmatik, Sprechsituation, Deixis. Universität Stuttgart, Institut für Linguistik. Papier 9. Stuttgart.

——. 1968b. McCawley's Tiefenstrukturen. Universität Stuttgart, Lehrstuhl für Linguistik. Papier 8. Stuttgart.

——. 1970. Tempus und Zeitreferenz im Deutschen. Linguistische Reihe 5, ed. by K. Baumgärtner, P. von Polenz, and H. Steger. Munich.

WUNDERLICH, H., and H. REIS. 1924–25. Der deutsche Satzbau. 2 vols., 3rd ed. Stuttgart-Berlin.

WUNDT, W. 1910–20. 'Völkerpsychologie'. 10 vols. Leipzig.

ŽIRMUNSKIJ. See SCHIRMUNSKI.

ZUPITZA, J. 1960. Einführung in das Studium des Mittelhochdeutschen. Fortgeführt von Franz Nobiling, neu bearbeitet von F. Tschirch. 2nd ed. Gronau.

ZUTT, H. 1956. *Adel* und *edel* — Wort und Bedeutung — bis ins 13. Jahrhundert Diss. Freiburg/Br. (Masch.)